



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-317660-23

### Development

BusConnects Kimmage to City Centre  
Core Bus Corridor Scheme

### Location

Kimmage to City Centre

### Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

### Applicant(s)

National Transport Authority

### Type of Application

Application under Section 51 (2) of the  
Roads Act 1993 as amended

### Observer(s)

Refer to Appendix 1.

### Date of Site Inspection

14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> November 2024, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
February 2025.

### Inspector

Fiona Fair

## Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	4
2.0 Site Location and Description .....	6
3.0 Proposed Development .....	8
4.0 Submissions .....	25
4.1. Prescribed Bodies .....	25
4.3. NTA Response to Prescribed Bodies .....	42
4.4. Third Party Observations.....	61
4.11. Planning History .....	94
5.0 Policy Context.....	98
5.1. European .....	98
5.5. National.....	99
5.16. Regional .....	107
5.18. Local.....	109
5.21. Legislative Context .....	133
5.24. Heritage Designations and EIA.....	133
5.25. Natural Heritage Designations .....	133
5.28. EIA Screening .....	135
6.0 Assessment.....	136
7.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	290

8.0 Environmental Impact Assessment .....	341
9.0 Recommendation.....	490
10.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	490
11.0 Conditions .....	499

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. The National Transport Authority has submitted an application to the Board under Section 51 (2) of the Roads Act 1993 as amended. This report sets out an assessment of the application submitted by the National Transport Authority for the development of a sustainable transport scheme which provides for both cycle and bus priority measures over a distance of approximately 3.7km from end to end online with two new footbridges over the Grand Canal in Portobello, a new pedestrian/cyclist boardwalk structure over the River Poddle in Kimmage between Sundrive Road and Mount Argus Way, where a steel boardwalk structure is proposed beside the River Poddle at the Stone Boat feature, and a secondary, quiet street, cycle route running parallel to Kimmage Road Lower, from Ravensdale Park to Mount Argus, along Poddle Park, Bangor Road, and Blarney Park to Sundrive Road. The proposed scheme will be comprised of three sections:
- (i) Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads (KCR) to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road.
  - (ii) Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal; and
  - (iii) Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.
- 1.2. The proposed scheme is 1 of 12 no. bus corridor schemes within the Dublin area under the Bus Connects programme and is accompanied by a Compulsory Purchase Order reference ABP 317682-23. The objectives of the schemes are to:
- Enhance the capacity and potential of the public transport system by improving bus speeds, reliability and punctuality.
  - Enhance the potential for cycling by providing safe infrastructure, segregated from general traffic wherever practicable.

- Support the delivery of an efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service, supporting the achievement of Ireland's emission reduction targets.
- Enable compact growth, regeneration opportunities and more effective use of land in Dublin.
- Improve accessibility to jobs, education, and other social and economic opportunities; and
- Ensure that the public realm is carefully considered in the design and development of the transport infrastructure and seek to enhance key urban focal points where appropriate and feasible.

1.3. Pre-application discussions were undertaken by the applicant with the Board in accordance with Section 51A of the Roads Act 1993 as amended, which provides for consultations with An Bord Pleanála before making an application under Section 51.

1.4. Since the commencement of the non-statutory period of the CBC Infrastructure Works, there has been a total of three rounds of non-statutory public consultation. The Emerging Preferred Route (EPR) non statutory public consultation phase for the Proposed Scheme occurred from February 2019 to May 2019. The Preferred Route Option (PRO) non-statutory public consultation took place from 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020 to 17<sup>th</sup> April 2020. The public were invited to make written submissions in relation to the published proposals to the BusConnects Infrastructure team either through an online form, by email or by post. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic all further planned events scheduled after 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020 were postponed. A third round of public consultation took place from 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020 to 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020. This third round was carried out using virtual consultation rooms, offering a 'call-back' facility along with descriptions, supporting documentation and mapping of the draft PRO as well as

information on all revisions, if any, made since the PRO non-statutory public consultation.

- 1.5. A determination in relation to whether the project is strategic infrastructure or not is not required under this Act.
- 1.6. The Application is accompanied by and EIAR and a NIS. No Oral Hearing was held in relation to the application as per the Boards Direction dated 18/11/2024.

## **2.0 Site Location and Description**

- 2.1. The proposed Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor (CBC) Scheme has an overall length of approximately 3.7 km consisting of three sections:

Section 1 - Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads (KCR) to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road, (at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park).

Section 2 - Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal; and

Section 3 - Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.

- 2.2. The Lower Kimmage Road from KCR to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road section is approximately 2.2km long and commences on Kimmage Road Lower at the KCR Junction with Kimmage Road West, Fortfield Road and Terenure Road West running in a north-easterly direction. Priority for buses will be provided along the entire length of this section of the Proposed Scheme. A secondary cycle route is also designated, running parallel to Kimmage Road Lower, along Poddle Park, Bangor Road, and Blarney Park to Sundrive Road. From Sundrive Road, a new cycle connection to Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View where a steel boardwalk structure is proposed beside the River Poddle at the Stone Boat feature.

- 2.3. From Harold's Cross Road and Harold's Cross Park the route proceeds towards the Grand Canal at Robert Emmet Bridge for a distance of 400 metres. Priority for buses will be provided along the entire length of this section of the Proposed Scheme, with retention and minor extension of the existing dedicated bus lanes along Harold's Cross Road. New segregated 1.5m wide cycle tracks are proposed in both directions along Harold's Cross Road. At the Grand Canal the route proceeds from Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal on Clanbrassil Street Upper and through to the Leonard's Corner Junction at South Circular Road, and then along Clanbrassil Street Lower and New Street South, until it reaches the junction with Kevin Street Upper and Patrick Street. At Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal, two new cycle/pedestrian bridge structures are proposed on either side of the existing arch bridge to provide footpaths and the northbound cycle track outside of the narrow bridge width. Priority for buses will be provided. New segregated cycle tracks will be provided in both directions along the full length of this section of the Proposed Scheme.
- 2.4. The Construction Phase for the Proposed Scheme is anticipated to take approximately 18 months to complete. It will be constructed based on individual sectional completions that will individually have shorter durations typically ranging between 3 to 15 months. Various amounts of third-party lands will be required to be compulsorily acquired along the entirety of the route to facilitate the proposed development.
- 2.5. Three Construction Compounds for the Proposed Scheme will be located at the following sites:
- Construction Compound K1 at Sundrive;
  - Construction Compound K2 at Our Lady's Hospice; and
  - Construction Compound K3 at St. Patrick's Court on Clanbrassil Street Lower.

- 2.6. Construction Compounds will be used as the primary location for the storage of materials, plant and equipment, site offices, worker welfare facilities and limited car parking. The Construction Compounds will be secured to ensure the safe storage of all on-site materials and machinery. Temporary fencing will be erected, and site security will be employed.

## **3.0 Proposed Development**

### **3.1. Overview**

- 3.1.1. In general, the Proposed Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme (“the Proposed Scheme”) provides upgrades to, and expansion/increase of the bus priority measures, cycling infrastructure and pedestrian facilities throughout the corridor. The measures being proposed include the provision of bus lanes, upgraded/relocated and additional bus stops, amendments to junctions, bus prioritisation through traffic management, segregated cycle tracks, amendments to parking and loading bay provisions (including reductions to and relocation of such areas), as well as improving pedestrian facilities (footpaths, signal crossings etc.), the provision/amendment of Toucan crossings to facilitate pedestrian and cyclist movements and the provision of landscaping/public realm improvements. (Toucan crossings are provided at signalised junctions which cannot accommodate segregated cycle crossings, i.e. crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are shared). Throughout the scheme, junction arrangements for general traffic are consolidated with turning radii reduced to slow traffic, left turning filter lanes omitted (to reduce unsafe conflicts between general traffic and cyclists/pedestrians), and specific junction crossing arrangements provided for pedestrians and cyclists. On minor junctions along the route raised table crossings are being provided to facilitate



pedestrian and cyclist crossing movements. The overall design approach for the Proposed Scheme, is set out in the Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet for BusConnect Core Bus Corridors which is included in the application documentation (Appendix A4.1 of the EIAR refers).

- 3.1.2. Transport modelling has been a key input to the scheme design throughout the project. Given the complexity of the scheme proposals and changes to existing traffic regimes, the design went through an iterative process which was incorporated in the multi-tiered transport modelling approach consisting of strategic, local, and microsimulation modelling.
- 3.1.3. Junctions within the entire BusConnects Core Bus Corridor programme have been categorised into 4 general types, and each is described in Appendix A4.1 of the submitted EIAR (BusConnects Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet - BPDG). It is important to note that only Junction Type 1 is proposed in the Proposed Scheme.
- 3.1.4. Junction Type 1 comprises dedicated bus lanes up to the junction stop line and general traffic travelling both straight ahead and turning left is restricted to one lane.
- 3.1.5. The Type 1 junction arrangement offers protection for cyclists (and pedestrians) at all junctions with protected kerbing provided on the corner of junctions, tighter turning radii are also provided at all junctions to force left-turning vehicles to slow down more, and the kerbing and cycle lane arrangements will require right-turning and straight-ahead cyclists to stay on the raised and segregated cycle track right up to the junction and will thus avoid traffic conflicts from weaving through lanes.
- 3.1.6. Appendix A6.3 of the EIAR specifically sets out the junction design of 10 junctions in the Proposed Scheme, namely:
  - Kimmage Cross Roads (KCR)
  - Ravensdale Park / Kimmage Road Lower

- Sundrive Cross
- Mount Argus View / Kimmage Road Lower
- Parkview Avenue / Harold's Cross Road
- Harold's Cross Road
- Grand Canal / Harold's Cross Road
- Leonard's Corner (South Circular Road / Clanbrassil Street)
- St Patrick's Street / New Street South
- Kenilworth Square / Harold's Cross Road

3.1.7. At bus stops it is generally proposed to provide bus shelters, and the stops are one of three typologies. There is a hierarchy in bus stop design options starting with the preferred "island bus stop", followed by the "shared bus stop landing zone", and then finally the "lay-by bus stop", each of these are described with images in section 4.6.4.5 of the EIAR and section 11 of the Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet (Appendix A4.1 of the EIAR). The location of Shared Landing Bus Stops, which are used for most of the bus stops along the Proposed Scheme, are described in Section 4.5 of the EIAR. Where there are no cycle tracks provided, inline bus stops are used, where the users departing the bus exit straight on the footway. Inline bus stops will typically be found in the constrained sections of the Proposed Scheme. There are no Layby Bus Stops proposed within the Proposed Scheme.

3.1.8. The island bus stop features the deflection of the cycle track behind the bus stop and any associated shelter which will be provided on a c. 3m wide island offering direct access and egress from buses. The deflected cycle track will be ramped and narrowed to reduce speeds and marked/lit to highlight pedestrian activity. A pedestrian priority crossing point is provided with part-time signals to avoid

cyclist/pedestrian conflicts for access to the bus stop area. Visually impaired pedestrians may call on part time signals within this arrangement, where necessary. In the shared bus stop landing zone arrangement the cycle track is again deflected behind the bus landing/access zone (but runs between the bus shelter/footpath area and the bus loading/offloading zone) with the same speed controls for cyclists augmented by corduroy tactile paving and additional narrowing of the track, and signage highlighting the presence of bus passenger traffic. There are no dedicated pedestrian priority signals in the shared bus stop landing zone although pedestrian priority is provided through design to allow crossing of the cycle track to a 1m wide dwell area where passengers can get on and off the bus.

3.1.9. A bus gate is a sign-posted short length of stand-alone bus lane which leads into a shared general traffic and bus lane. General traffic will be directed by signage to divert away to other roads before it can arrive at the bus gates.

3.1.10. Four Bus Gates are proposed along the Proposed Scheme to ensure bus priority, as follows:

- Bus Gate No.1: On R817 Kimmage Road Lower, just north of the Ravensdale Park Junction.
- Bus Gate No.2A: On R817 Kimmage Road Lower, just south of Harold's Cross Park.
- Bus Gate No.2B: On R817 Kimmage Road Lower, at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park and
- Bus Gate No.3: On the R137 at the Harold's Cross Road and Kenilworth Park Junction.

3.1.11. The Bus gates will be operational from:

- Bus Gate 1 - 6am to 10am and 4pm to 8pm, 7 days a week in both directions.

- Bus Gate 2A – 24 hours, in both directions, 7 days a week.
- Bus Gate 2B – 6am to 10am in a northbound direction, 7 days a week and south bound on a 24-hour basis / 7-days a week.
- Bus Gate 3 - This Bus Gate will operate on a 24-hour / 7-day basis.

3.1.12. The hours of operation of the Bus Gate will be subject to ongoing review based on prevailing traffic conditions and the goal of achieving the Proposed Scheme objectives. The NTA and local authority will co-operate to address any issues with the hours of operation that may arise during the lifetime of the Proposed Scheme.

3.1.13. As a general policy, shelters will be provided at all bus stops. This will improve the comfort of passengers waiting for a bus during poor weather, as well as providing shade on sunny days. It is acknowledged, that in some locations, such as those designated as Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA), it may not be appropriate to provide a bus shelter in front of a building of heritage value to minimise visual impact. I note however the subject scheme does not transverse any ACA.

3.1.14. Signage throughout the Proposed Scheme will be in accordance with the Traffic Signs Manual. Additional signage will be provided throughout to ensure new traffic arrangements and management is clear and will require the use of specifically designed signage to ensure that road users have clarity on the rights of way and yielding necessary to ensure satisfactory operation of the BusConnects system. Some bespoke signage will be necessary including the use left turn flashing amber arrows to ensure motorists turning left are aware of, and yield to, cyclists. Furthermore, one of the characteristics of the Proposed Scheme is that predominantly there will be a ban on left turns from the bus lanes and accordingly “No Left Turn from Bus Lane” signage will be required (i.e. in most situations general traffic will not be allowed to filter into a bus lane to make a left turn, and taxi’s and

buses wishing to do so will be required to move into the general lane when approaching type 1 junctions).

3.1.15. The Proposed Scheme provides for the following in terms of carriageway and footpath widths:

- Bus lanes, generally of 3m in width in areas with a speed limit <60kmph and 3.25m in areas with a speed limit of >60kph.
- General traffic lanes, as above – although 2.75m lanes are permissible on straight roads sections with very low HGV traffic.
- Pedestrian paths, generally with a minimum width of 2m, however 1.2m minimum widths being considered appropriate at pinch points.
- Segregated cycle tracks, generally with a width of 2m (one-way), segregation is provided through kerbing between the cycle tracks and pedestrian paths and/or bus lanes/stops.

3.1.16. The overall design allows for deviations from the above specified lane widths over shorter sections to allow for specific physical constraints, e.g. to avoid extant buildings, protection/ avoidance of mature trees, traffic pedestrian safety, or reduce CPO/land-take requirements. The Proposed Scheme does not include bus or traffic lanes of less than 3m in width, where pinch points have to be addressed these are accommodated through deviations (narrowing) in cycle track and pedestrian widths and are discussed further in the section descriptions below.

3.1.17. The Proposed Scheme will make significant improvements to pedestrian and cycling facilities and to bus priority. Key changes that will be made to the existing corridor are the following:

- The number of pedestrian signal crossings (incl. at junctions) will increase from 35 to 47.
- The proportion of segregated cycle facilities will increase from 3.2Km on the existing corridor to 4Km on the proposed scheme.
- The proportion of the route having bus priority measures will increase from 18% on the existing corridor to 100% on the Proposed Scheme.

3.1.18. The proposed scheme is broken into the following geographical sections:

- Section 1: Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road
- Section 2: Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal
- Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.

#### **Section 1: Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road**

3.1.19. This section of the Proposed Scheme will be approximately 2.2km long and will commence on R817 Kimmage Road Lower at the KCR Junction with R818 Kimmage Road West, R817 Fortfield Road and R818 Terenure Road West. The Proposed Scheme will proceed along R817 Kimmage Road Lower in a north-eastern direction generally and will conclude at the junction with R137 Harold's Cross Road at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park.

3.1.20. Priority for buses will be provided along the entire length of this section of the Proposed Scheme, with dedicated bus lanes in either direction over a length of 260m northbound, and 200m southbound from the KCR Junction to where a southern Bus

Gate is proposed just north of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower and Ravensdale Park Junction. This Bus Gate will operate in tandem with Bus Gates at Harold's Cross Park to preclude through-traffic over the intervening 2km length of this section, to R137 Harold's Cross Road at Harold's Cross Park. The Bus Gates will operate at peak times to secure bus priority by deflecting through-traffic off this route, while ensuring enhanced amenity for local residents with the development of a quieter street (with existing parking arrangements unchanged) than currently exists. Local traffic access will be diverted via Sundrive Road on the western side or Larkfield Avenue on the eastern side.

3.1.21. The provision of the southern Bus Gate at the Ravensdale Park Junction will be complemented by a number of traffic management measures on adjoining residential streets to prevent through-traffic or 'rat-running' as follows:

- Near the southern Bus Gate, Poddle Park to the west will be closed to through traffic, except for cyclists, at the junction with Ravensdale Park.
- To the east of the southern Bus Gate, Derravaragh Road will be closed to through-traffic, except for cyclists, at the southern side of the junction with Corrib Road; and
- For southbound traffic diverted by the proposed southern Bus Gate, improvements will be made to the junction of R137 Harold's Cross Road and Kenilworth Park by way of the provision of a southbound right-turn to facilitate local access to R817 Kimmage Road Lower from the north. This will require adjustment to the junction for efficient traffic operation, and a westbound Bus Gate from Kenilworth Square will simplify the signal staging.

3.1.22. Segregated cycle tracks will be provided in either direction along the southern sub-section of the Proposed Scheme that precedes the Bus Gate at the Ravensdale Park

Junction. After this point, the existing advisory cycle lanes will be retained and not altered, as the road conditions will be much enhanced as a result of the reduced general traffic restricted by the Bus Gate.

- 3.1.23. A secondary cycle route will also be designated, in parallel to R817 Kimmage Road Lower, along Poddle Park, Bangor Road, and Blarney Park to Sundrive Road. From Sundrive Road, cyclists will be able to proceed via a new connection to Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View where a proposed steel boardwalk structure will be provided beside the River Poddle at the Stone Boat feature (as outlined in Section 4.6.8 and in Chapter 15 (Archaeological & Cultural Heritage)).
- 3.1.24. At Harold's Cross Park south, it will be necessary to remove the existing footpath on the northern side of the street adjoining the park over a length of 50m so as to accommodate road widening for two-way traffic on the access route between the proposed Bus Gates to Mount Jerome Cemetery and Mount Argus Road. Most pedestrians walk through the park when it is open during the day. At other times there is the alternative footpath along the southern side of the street. The alternative to this proposal would be to remove the five on-street parking spaces in front of houses for which there is no other parking available nearby.
- 3.1.25. Within the Bus Gates section along the R817 Kimmage Road Lower, the existing advisory cycle lanes will be retained, which is a deviation from the design guide that proposes segregated cycle tracks to be provided generally. In this context, the traffic volumes will be very low due to the Bus Gate and a 30 km/h (kilometres per hour) speed limit will apply, which will provide a context in which advisory cycle lanes are appropriate.



## **Section 2: Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal**

- 3.1.26. This section of the Proposed Scheme will commence at the junction of R817 Kimmage Road Lower and R137 Harold's Cross Road at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park and will proceed north for a distance of 400m, to the Grand Canal at Robert Emmet Bridge.
- 3.1.27. Priority for buses will be provided along the entire length of this section of the Proposed Scheme, with retention and minor extension of the existing dedicated bus lanes along R137 Harold's Cross Road. In the northbound direction, the existing bus lane will be extended by 60m to the stop line at the junction with R111 Parnell Road at the northern end. Left-turning general traffic will not be permitted in the bus lane, and there will be a separate signal stage for the bus only before the general traffic lane green signal. This will avoid any conflicts between left turning traffic from the right-hand lane that will cross in front of the bus lane. To accommodate this revised signal control arrangement, the existing right-turn movement into R111 Grove Road will be prohibited and all general traffic will use the right-hand lane only. The number of right-turning vehicles is low, and these can instead turn right at Leonard's Corner into R811 South Circular Road, 300m further north. It is likely that traffic from the Kimmage direction and further south will change route away from R817 Kimmage Road Lower due to the proposed Bus Gates and may instead join the orbital route along the Grand Canal further west at Clogher Road.
- 3.1.28. In the southbound direction, the existing bus lane will be extended by 35m at the northern end, and by 95m at the southern end so that there will be a continuous bus lane over the full 400m length.
- 3.1.29. New segregated 1.5m wide cycle tracks will be provided in both directions along R137 Harold's Cross Road. Wider 2m cycle tracks are not feasible in the constrained context of the street.

- 3.1.30. Between Harold's Cross Park and the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice (a distance of 85m) there is on-street parking in indented bays with 10 spaces on the western side in front of No. 66 to 84 Harold's Cross Road, and seven spaces on the eastern side in front of No.75 to 85 Harold's Cross Road. The existing 10 parking spaces on the western side of the street will be removed to accommodate the proposed northbound cycle track. The existing seven parking spaces on the eastern side of the street will be retained. To compensate for the loss of the 10 on-street parking spaces, it is proposed to provide a new public car park with 22 spaces on the grounds of Our Lady's Hospice where there is a lawn area just inside the entrance. There will be a net additional 12 parking spaces available in this car park for the other residents along R137 Harold's Cross Road where there is a general shortage of parking in the local area.
- 3.1.31. To accommodate the proposed cycle tracks, road widening will be required of typically 2m over a length of 120m from the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice on the western side to the junction of Mount Drummond Avenue on the eastern side. There is a pinch-point between the hospice entrance and the gate of St. Clare's School on the opposite eastern side, where the distance between buildings is just 19m, and the public road width is 17.2m wide at the narrowest point. The proposed road cross-section will be 18m wide to include two 3m bus lanes, two 3m traffic lanes, two 2m footpaths and two 1.5m cycle tracks. Widening of approximately 0.8m will be required on the eastern side to achieve the 18m width. This will involve encroachment into a garden area at the front of a sheltered housing development operated by Focus Ireland, that is 2.6m wide at that location. It will also be necessary to set back the most northerly of the four gate pillars at the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice, which will be re-erected with the existing cut granite stone materials.

- 3.1.32. The proposed road widening will be on the eastern side of the street, north of St. Clare's School, with encroachment into the front gardens of 15 houses at No. 33 to 61 Harold's Cross Road and at the entrance to St. Clare's School. These houses are arranged in three terraces of four houses at each end, and a middle terrace of six houses, with the fifteenth property on the corner of Mount Drummond Avenue. The front gardens of the northern and southern terraces of houses are 5.5m long, and these will be reduced by the proposed 2m road widening to 3.5m long. The houses are set at a higher level at about 0.6m above the street level with a short set of steps on the path to the front door. There are no driveways, and residents with cars park on side streets nearby. Accommodation works will be required in the gardens behind the new boundary wall to provide replacement steps or ramps.
- 3.1.33. There is no on-street parking along this section of R137 Harold's Cross Road, north of Our Lady's Hospice, and this gives rise to difficulties for the residents to receive deliveries or for loading and unloading activities. To address this problem, it is proposed to provide an indented parking bay with four spaces in front of the middle terrace of houses at No. 43 to 53 Harold's Cross Road, which is setback from the adjoining terraces by an additional 3.5m, with 9m long front gardens. The parking bay will encroach by a further 2.5m into these gardens, which will be shortened by 4.5m to 4.5m long.
- 3.1.34. Four small street trees will be removed in the road widening on the eastern side and these will be replaced by a larger number of new trees at the proposed parking bay, and at the junction of Mount Drummond Avenue which will be narrowed at the corners to provide a shorter crossing for pedestrians, where four new on-street parking spaces will be provided in a revised junction layout with R137 Harold's Cross Road.

- 3.1.35. North of Mount Drummond Avenue, the existing road is wider at typically 20m wide between boundaries, which can accommodate the proposed 18m wide cross-section, with wider footpaths of up to 3m. This additional space will enable an Island Bus Stop to be provided.
- 3.1.36. The street width reduces to 18m at the junction of Armstrong Street, 60m south of the junction with the R111 on Parnell Road and Grove Road at the Grand Canal. It narrows further to less than 18m over the final 20m to the corner of R111 Parnell Road, where road widening is proposed with encroachment into the garden space at the Fottrell House office building on the south-western side of the junction.
- 3.1.37. The Proposed Scheme has been designed in accordance with the PDGB (NTA 2021) (refer to Appendix A4.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR) and the TII publications referenced within the PDGB. However, at a number of constrained locations across the Proposed Scheme, the width of the cross-sectional elements has been designed below the desirable minimum identified in the PDGB (as outlined in Section 4.6.1). Most notable, the width of cycle tracks on the R137 Harolds Cross Road have been reduced to 1.5m generally and 1.2m over short lengths to fit within the constrained road width.

### **Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction**

- 3.1.38. Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme will be approximately 1km long and will commence at Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and will proceed through to the Leonard's Corner Junction at R811 South Circular Road, and then along the R137 on Clanbrassil Street Lower and New Street South, until it reaches the junction with R110 Kevin Street Upper and R137 Patrick Street.

- 3.1.39. At Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal, two new cycle / pedestrian bridge structures are proposed on either side of the existing arch bridge to provide footpaths and the northbound cycle track outside of the narrow bridge width.
- 3.1.40. Priority for buses will be provided mainly with dedicated bus lanes for most of the length, apart from short sections where bus lanes cannot be accommodated within the narrow street and signal controlled bus priority will be provided at the key junction of Leonard's Corner on R811 South Circular Road.
- 3.1.41. New segregated cycle tracks will be provided in both directions along the full length of this section of the Proposed Scheme.
- 3.1.42. The proposed scheme has been designed in accordance with PDGB (NTA 2021) and the TII publications referenced within the PDGB. However, it is notable that cycle tracks are reduced to 1.5m wide over 500m length from the Grand Canal to St. Patrick's Court / Lombard Street West (R137 Clanbrassil Street Road Upper and Lower) to fit in the constrained space available in the street.

**Key improvements and Specific works include:**

- 7.4 km (two-way) of bus priority infrastructure and traffic management.
- Increase in bus priority from approximately 24% (citybound) and 6.5% (outbound) to 100% bus priority.
- 8.0 km (total both directions) of cycling infrastructure and facilities.
- No segregated cycling facilities are currently provided along the Proposed Scheme. This will increase to 100% in both directions with 47% being fully segregated, and the remainder on quiet streets, both within the Bus Gate section along Kimmage Road Lower, and along the parallel Poddle Cycleway.

- The number of pedestrian signal crossings on main roads between junctions will increase from five to nine (+80%).
- The pedestrian crossing facilities at three of the existing 10 junctions will be improved through the provision of additional crossings to enable more direct and convenient pedestrian movements.
- Two new footbridges over the Grand Canal in Portobello.
- A new pedestrian/cyclist boardwalk structure over the River Poddle in Kimmage between Sundrive Road and Mount Argus Way.
- Provision of new/refurbished pedestrian facilities and footpaths along the scheme and associated ancillary works.
- Provision of 12 junction upgrades and associated ancillary works.
- Provision of 29 new/refurbished raised table side entry facilities.
- Reconfiguration of existing bus stops resulting in 23 number new bus stop facilities.
- Public realm works including landscaping, planting, street furniture, street lighting, retaining walls, boundary walls and sustainable urban drainage (SUDs) measures.
- A total loss of 46 net parking / loading spaces along the Proposed Scheme.
- The benefits resulting from the 2028 AM Peak Hour people-movement assessment shows that there is an increase of 80% in the number of people travelling by bus, an increase of 8% in the number of people walking or cycling, and a reduction of 50% in the number of people travelling by car along the route of the Proposed Scheme.

Specific details relating to all aspects of the development are outlined within the 'Project Design' section of this report within the assessment section hereunder.

### **3.2. Drainage**

- 3.2.1. The surface water drainage system for the Proposed Scheme will discharge to 22 catchment areas based on topography and the existing pipe network. Whilst in some areas the Proposed Scheme will increase the impermeable areas, additional permeable areas are also provided by the softening of urban realm along the routes. The drainage design aims to sustain flow levels within the existing pipe network after a rainfall event by controlling the discharge rate within each catchment. Flows will be controlled by the implementation of SuDS techniques, where practicable. One of the principal objectives of the road drainage system is to minimise the impact of the runoff from the roadways on the surrounding environment via the position of: filter drains, swales, bio-retention areas, tree pits, oversized pipes, silt traps and attenuation features if necessary.

### **3.3. Construction**

- 3.3.1. The construction phase is estimated to last for approx. 18 months and will be carried out in phases along the corridor, in this regard the Board is referred to Chapter 5, Table 5.2 of the EIAR which sets out the proposed phases, and duration of the construction programme over the total of 7 different sections of the route. The programme and location of works has been designed to provide as much separation between sections under construction at any given time. The main components of each of the construction stages are set out below:

- Site preparation and clearance,

- Removal of existing boundaries, pavements, lighting columns, bus stops, and signage,
- Protection and/or diversion of buried services,
- Road widening, pavement reconstruction, and kerb improvements,
- Reconfiguration of traffic lanes throughout,
- Installation of new bus stops and junction/roundabout modification,
- Property boundary reinstatement, signage replacement, relocation of and/or installation of lighting columns, and
- Landscaping and tree planting and reinstatement of temporary land acquisitions.

The applicant lodged the application to the Board on the 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023. The application was accompanied by the following documents:

- Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR)
  - Appendices including but not exclusively:
    - Planning report.
    - Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet for Busconnects Core Bus Corridor (BCPDG)
    - Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
    - Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)
    - Transport Modelling report
    - Junction Design Report
- Natura Impact Assessment (NIS)
- Location Maps, plans and particulars, (General Arrangement Maps)
- Relevant Public Notices and Prescribed Body Notices.



## **4.0 Submissions**

### **4.1. Prescribed Bodies**

- 4.1.1. Submissions have been received from 3 no. prescribed bodies which are summarised hereunder. Submissions are generally in support of the proposed development and do not raise any significant issues in relation to the EIAR or NIS submitted. General comments are made in relation to works relating to footpath widths, local public realm improvements, land acquisition by the NTA, construction compounds, bus shelter design, the removal of vegetation, the design of the two new footbridges over the Grand Canal in Portobello at Robert Emmet Bridge and impact on the setting of Recorded Monument DU018-043003, known as the 'Tongue' or 'Stoneboat'.

#### **1. Dublin City Council**

- In terms of planning policy, it is stated that the proposed development is in compliance with the RSES and is recognised as a development which will support regional growth for the Eastern and Midlands Region and the Dublin MASP. High quality bus corridors will enable and support the delivery of both residential and economic development opportunities.
- It is noted that the RSES supports the delivery of key sustainable transport projects including BusConnects as set out in RPO 5.2
- The proposal has been considered in relation to the core strategy of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022 – 2028 – sustainable movement and transport and other relevant policies.
- Policies of note include:
  - SMTI Modal Shift and Compact Growth
  - SMT3 Integrated Transport Network

- SMT4 Integration of Public Transport Services and Development
  - SMT8 Public Realm Enhancements
  - SMT11 Pedestrian Network
  - SMT22 Key Sustainable Transport Projects
  - QHSN11 15-Minute City
  - CEE12 Transition to a Low Carbon, Climate Resilient City Economy
- It is stated that it is not the role of Dublin City Council to comment on the acceptability or not of the EIAR and its findings, but it is noted, that the content points generally to the development having negligible impact on the existing environment.
  - The NIS is acceptable, no concerns are raised in relation to the conclusion of the NIS.
  - The proposed scheme will, for the most part, will comprise lands within the existing public road and pedestrian pavement area where there is no specific zoning objective. The areas required for Construction Compounds will be for a temporary period. Reinstatement works will be carried out following construction.
  - Dublin City Council is satisfied that the elements of the proposed development which fall within the Council boundary would not have any excessive or undue impact on the amenities of the area.
  - It is acknowledged that there will be a degree of disruption in terms of traffic management during construction but thereafter there is unlikely to be adverse impact on existing amenities.
  - There will be a need for sharing of space including kerbside space, which will need to be managed to ensure that there is no undue adverse impact on the

ability of residents and visitors to access local services on foot or on the ability to achieve the '15-minute city'.

#### Forward Planning Department Comments

- The scheme is supported by the high-level policies in place in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

#### City Archaeologist comments:

- The scheme runs adjacent to the River Poddle for much of its length and passes through a number of Zones of Archaeological Potential for Recorded Monuments which are listed on the Record of Monuments and Places (RMP) and are subject to statutory protection under Section 12 of the National Monuments (Amendment) Act 1994.
- The scheme will also impact sites listed on the Dublin City Industrial Heritage Record. Archaeological mitigation in these areas will be required where subsurface excavation is proposed.
- The proposed construction of a boardwalk along the River Poddle will have a direct and permanent impact on the setting of Recorded Monument DU018-043003, known as the 'Tongue' or 'Stoneboat'.
- In total the EIAR identifies impacts on one site designated as a National Monument, eight sites listed on the Records of Monuments and Places (RMP), and five sites listed on the Dublin City Industrial Heritage Record (DCIHR). There is also a potential impact on one non designated cultural heritage site.
- Recommends a redesign of the deck / boardwalk to highlight the Tongue, perhaps incl. glass or similar transparent panels directly above it to ensure visibility.

- Recommends that the section of the route at Robert Emmett Memorial Bridge be considered for redesign with a view to reducing impact on the visual setting of the bridge, retaining historic walling and allowing pedestrian access to the Robert Emmett memorial safely.

Parks, Biodiversity and Landscape Services Comments:

- Parks is not supportive of a proposal that provides a route through Ravensdale (Poddle) & Mt. Argus Park's for commuting cyclists whose speed will be at odds with the public using the Park's. In addition, it is noted that the Park is locked at night.
- There is lack of detail relating to the width of the proposed cycle path within both parks but the current footpath width of 2m will be insufficient for a shared scheme and will necessitate constructing a new two way cycle-way to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.
- The construction of a two-way cycle path through the root zone of the existing trees will cause damage.
- Planning permission has already been granted for the incorporation of a Flood Alleviation scheme in Ravensdale (Poddle) park. The combined effect of the flood alleviation scheme and the proposed cycleway will result in further fragmentation, damage to the existing tree canopy and alter the character of the park to its detriment.
- A suggested solution would be for cyclists to remain on the Kimmage Road Lower rather than detour through the park- for cyclists travelling to city centre/Kimmage village this is the most direct route and will link up with the proposed cycle track which is on road from Ravensdale Park junction.
- The proposed cycle track through Mt Argus Park appears to involve the construction of a new bridge and travel through an area of trees that have

not been surveyed. The impact on these trees of the new two-way cycle path and bridge construction should be clarified.

- Concern of the detail on plans submitted, lack of clarity where footways and kerbs are getting reduced or widened, no street lighting or signage is shown on the GA or landscape plans.
- Specific comments include:
  - Welcome tree planting on KRL.
  - Potential to daylight the short section of the Poddle River should be an objective rather than retaining car parking at the 'Poddle Cycleway' area.
  - Proposals of tree planting on existing river culvert should be reviewed
  - To maintain the visually open quality at Mount Argus View entrance (below) the new tree planting shall be reduced to four fastigiate oaks on the outer grass margins.
  - The visual quality of the Mount Argus entrance would be improved by the introduction of natural stone paving, rather than extensive areas of concrete and by a reduction in the proposed car parking spaces on either side of the entrance. The existing bicycle stands should also be retained or repositioned in the scheme.

City Architects Department comments:

- Welcomes the proposal in principle.
- The design of the public realm will be fundamental to the success of the Proposed Scheme.
- The design needs to be supported by pedestrian traffic counts. Footpaths should be designed to be universally accessible and pedestrian environments enhanced.

- All historic fabric and features should be retained and protected, and the settings of protected structures and buildings within Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA's) should be respected insofar as possible within the Proposed Scheme.
- The inclusion of an overlay of existing survey drawings onto the General Arrangement Drawings as submitted for the Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme would have facilitated a better assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing public realm.
- As this route involves works to and/or adjacent to Protected Structures their curtilage incl. Historic Fabric and within Conservation Areas, the applicant is to confirm that all works proposed must comply with Part IV of the Planning and Development Act 2000. This includes guidelines under S.52 (1) for the protection of structures, or parts of structures, and the preservation of the character of architectural conservation areas.
- Bus shelters impact on the width of footpaths and should only be proposed where there is sufficient space to physically accommodate them and passengers congregating in their vicinity. It is unclear if there is sufficient width to the footpaths in some locations where bus shelters are proposed e.g. the proposed south bound bus stop and bus shelter on Harold's Cross Rd to the west side of Harold's Cross Park, (Sheet 06), and the proposed north bound bus stop and bus shelter on Clanbrassil St Upper, (Sheet 08).
- Request that by condition, full details of the design and type of each bus shelter for each location shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development

- Recommends conditions of compliance for Bus Shelters, utility cabinets, on-street parking, palette of materials, palette of street furniture, boundary treatments, new pedestrian and cycle bridges, conservation, stoneboat Boardwalk, art strategy, painted medians, traffic signals and signage poles, public lighting, water drinking fountains and village signage.

### Conservation Section

- Sets out the policy of DCC with respect to Conservation & Trees.
- Refers to Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)
- Sets out guidelines and technical advice for street furniture, paving and kerbing.
- The Conservation Section finds that a thorough study of the receiving environment has been carried out.
- The assessment of architectural heritage, streetscape and the urban environment submitted as part of the EIAR and the proposed mitigation measures across the scheme is generally welcomed.
- Appendix A16.1 Historical Background provides a detailed and well-researched discussion on the history of the development of the route.
- Appendix A16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites provides a written and photographic record, importance rating and sensitivity rating for all protected structures, NIAH-recorded structures, designed landscapes, unprotected structures of built heritage significance, street furniture, paving and surface treatments. The record is comprehensive and accurately describes the quality and status of the heritage structures along the proposed route.

- Appendix A16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric, Section 3.2.1 provides a statement on protection of architectural heritage structures and features during works. 'Some architectural heritage features will require protection during the course of works, where there is potential for damage of sensitive fabric during the course of works proposed in close proximity to them.
- Historic or sensitive fabric will be recorded in position prior to the commencement of construction works, protected, and monitored for the duration. Appropriate protections will be determined depending on the nature of the fabric and the construction activities. Protective measures will include cordoning off as appropriate and/or the provision of protective wrapping or temporary hoardings or boxing off More specific protections are outlined in the relevant sections of this methodology'.
- The following are considered by the Conservation Section to be the key impacts of the Kimmage to City Centre route in relation to architectural heritage: Each is considered in detail in the submitted report.
  - Protected Structures and their settings.
  - NIAH Structures and their settings
  - ACA's
  - CA's
  - Industrial Heritage Sites.
  - Potential impacts on historic paving and kerbing, historic street furniture and lamp standards and other features.
  - Lamp Posts and Tram Standards
  - Milestones
  - Other Street Furniture / Finishes
  - Proposed Tree Removal



- Boundary Treatments
- Cycle Lanes
- New Traffic Semaphore & Signage
- Proposed Bus Stop Locations
- Conditions are recommended

#### Environment and Transportation Department Comments

- Generally supportive of the proposed scheme.
- Scheme will remove bicycles from bus lane and therefore improve speed of bus service.
- Dublin City Council recognises that the bus is the most important mode of public transport in Dublin, and it is stated that in 2019, almost 160 million journeys were made by bus in the Dublin Region, representing 65% of all public transport trips in the Dublin area.
- It is stated that the DCC/ NTA cordon count in 2019 showed that the bus was the single highest mode of transport crossing the canal, 30% of all trips, and the bus accounted for over half of all public transport trips into the city centre.
- The return of bus passenger number to above pre covid levels is noted and the increase of Bus use at weekends of 27% over the pre covid levels, is also noted, as very welcome.

#### Traffic Division Comments

- Supportive of the proposal and recognises the significant improvements in terms of safe cycling measures and in enabling an efficient public transportation service along the route.
- It is essential on all BusConnects corridors to ensure that the bus service is given priority.

- DCC states that links to bus information in relation to traffic flow management will be upgraded to improve this service and ensure free flow for buses. This digital improvement is necessary to ensure the scheme operates to its full potential.
- The DCC centralised traffic control system has for a number of years been linked to the bus automatic vehicle location system via a bespoke software called DPTIM and this link provides details of the bus location, its journey pattern and if the bus is ahead or behind schedule. For the BusConnects project this system is being upgraded to link to the next Generation Automatic vehicle location system which will allow finer grain information to be transmitted to the DCC system for dynamic management of the corridor.
- DCC have carried out modelling work to mimic the real-life operation of the project.
- It is stated that the design of this scheme is difficult and complex and has called for multiple interventions along the road network in order to achieve its objectives. The use of bus priority signals, bus gates and a combination of one-way systems and turn bans are all intended to alter the current traffic situation along the route and ensure that public transport, walking and cycling can be prioritised over the private car.
- DCC recommends that the corridor needs to be considered as a whole and that the various different measures to prioritise public transport walking and cycling, need to be implemented in as full a manner as possible to avoid "watering down "the benefits of this scheme by making localised changes to the design.
- Camera based bus lane enforcement will need to be rolled out.

- The enhanced data garnered by DCC from the next Generation AVL system and the next generation Bus priority system currently being specified will play a key role in how the corridor is dynamically managed to ensure that the bus journey times and headways are met.
- Digital infrastructure along with the proposed civil infrastructure for traffic signals are both required for the corridor to meet its objectives.

#### Road Division Comments

- The Roads Department is generally supportive of the scheme and its intention to improve bus and cycling provision.
- Scheme should seek to ensure sufficient and appropriate footpath widths of minimum 2 m and seek to improve pedestrian connectivity to bus stops and ensure pedestrian priority for people with accessibility issues incl visual impairments.
- Ensuring pedestrian priority is important particularly in the context of people with accessibility issues including visual impairments. Pedestrians, in accordance with all levels of policy, should be ensured priority through signage and other appropriate measures.
- Safeguarding the ability of local services to operate is imperative. The extent of loss of loading bays is not clearly quantified in the schemes, nor is the adequacy of alternative provision demonstrated. More information and clarity in this regard would provide comfort that the scheme will continue to support the operation of local businesses. In addition to loading facilities, on street parking is also affected including at commercial units.
- The location of proposed trees on the west side of Kimmage Road Lower needs to be carefully considered so as to minimise obstruction of footpath. A minimum of 2m clear unobstructed width is required.

- The location of proposed trees needs to be carefully considered so as not to obstruct the footpath. A minimum of 2m clear unobstructed width is required. Proposed trees should also not impede sightlines. Car parking appears to be proposed too close to the Sundrive Road junction on both sides. This should be further set back from the junction as well as from pedestrian crossings.
- At the revised junction layout of Mount Argus View and Kimmage Road Lower tree planting should take cognisance of sightlines and ensure unobstructed footpaths. At the revised Mount Argus Church junction the location of trees and parking should not be too close to junction. Parallel parking is preferred to perpendicular for safety reasons.
- It is noted that a loading bay is proposed inside the bus gate. Signage should possibly clarify that loading is also permissible as well as local access.
- The submitted drawing does not appear to take cognisance of the St. Clare's Park development including its access junction layout. There is a current proposal to relocate the existing bus stop southwards away from the St. Clare's junction. The new position has been agreed between the developer, Dublin City Council and the National Transport Authority.
- There are serious concerns regarding the removal of the footpath along the southern boundary of Harold's Cross Park and the absence of crossing facilities for pedestrians to link to the opposite footpath. It is proposed that the footpath ends abruptly. However, pedestrians are not directed to a crossing point which would allow them to safely access the southern opposite footpath. Proposed trees within footpaths should be sited so as to ensure minimum 2m unobstructed footpath.
- Proposed access arrangements to the new car park within Our Lady's Hospice grounds are not clear. It is also not clear what is proposed regarding the main access arrangements to the Our Lady's Hospice campus from Harolds Cross

Road. It would appear that the footpath is being extended across the junction with a cycle lane adjacent therefore it is not clear how vehicular access is being provided at this location. The submitted documentation indicates that this car park will be available for residents along Harolds Cross Road.

However, it is not clear how this could be managed having regard to the fact that the car park is to be located within a private site and be accessed from a private road. For Dublin City Council to manage the car park including public access to same, it and the access road would have to be taken in charge by Dublin City Council.

- At the revised Mount Drummond Junction an alternative car parking arrangement should be considered in the redesign. Parallel parking is preferred to perpendicular parking for safety reasons. Parking should also be located further away from the junction.

#### Environmental Protection Division

- It is stated that the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be integrated with all other environmental aspects of the project, using best practice solutions.
- It is stated that the development must comply with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.
- Enclosed drainage channels such as slot drains or "ACO" drains are not acceptable.
- Hybrid gullies are not acceptable.
- The use of narrow profile gullies is welcome.
- It must be confirmed that the development has been designed such that risk of flooding has been reduced as far as is reasonably practicable.

- The proposal must demonstrate that it passes the three stages of the SFRA Justification Test, particularly for fluvial flooding.
- New compensatory SuDS measures should be close to any green areas lost.
- With respect to the Wastewater Framework Directive: The report notes that the developer shall provide an evidence-based assessment of the impact, if any, of the proposed scheme on the water quality status of both rivers within the curtilage of the proposed project, including both ecological and chemical status.

#### Overall Recommendation / Conditions

- Appendix 1 of the DCC report sets out agreed conditions between NTA and DCC. In respect of:
  - Handover: Comprehensive agreement of handover to NTA and hand back process.
  - Consultation between Departments.
  - Design
  - Reinstatement
  - Construction period.
  - Miscellaneous: Cellars
  - Public Lighting
  - Environmental Protection: Drainage
  - Archaeology
- NTA to appoint a Project Archaeologist as a member of the NTA project team to oversee all archaeological aspects of the project from inception to completion. The Project Archaeologist will manage archaeological aspects of the project and input on, inter alia:
  - Project planning and design,

- Scheduling of archaeological mitigation,
- The development of programmes,
- The development of construction and procurement strategies,
- The preparation of contract documentation,
- The appointment of competent consultant archaeologists,
- Advance works, construction and potential operational issues.
- Parks, Biodiversity and Landscape Services
  - Tree Bond
  - Landscape scheme
  - Tree protection
  - Bat and bird conservation
  - NIS
- Air & Noise Pollution
  - Works to be carried out in accordance with a CEMP.
- Conservation
  - All works shall be designed and supervised by an expert in architectural conservation in accordance with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and relevant documents of the DHLGH Advice Series.
  - All works shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice, the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the Advice Series issued by the Department of the Housing, Local Government and Heritage. All repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ. Items to be

removed for repair off-site shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement.

- A redesigned scheme at Robert Emmet Bridge that is of higher architectural quality than the submitted proposal and that would lessen the physical and visual impact on the historic masonry bridge shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority in advance of works commencing. New work and materials should be of the highest possible architectural quality, should complement the historic features of the bridge and should be legible as new interventions. This redesign shall be informed by a revised architectural heritage impact assessment, by a suitably qualified conservation professional, providing detailed design information and outlining the nature and likely impacts of the proposed bridge extension.
- The concealment/ burial of historic walls at Clanbrassil Street Upper is not appropriate.
- The Conservation Section recommends the omission of bus shelters in front of and in the immediate vicinity of Protected Structures across the route and for bus stops only to be considered at these locations, in order to minimise visual clutter and protect the special architectural character of Protected Structures.
- Architecture
  - Footpaths should be designed to be universally accessible and pedestrian environments enhanced.



- Detailed drawings and specifications of the proposed public realm improvement schemes shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.
- Taking in charge agreement.
- Details of design and type of each bus shelter.
- Engagement with EV operators.
- Sustainability and re use of fabric.
- Revised proposals for the Emmet Bridge
- Further information is required on the design of the Stoneboat Bridge/ boardwalk, measures to address any potential anti-social behavior and a full landscaping proposal are to be submitted and agreed with DCC Planning department prior to commencement of development.
- Planting
- Signage.

## **2. TII**

- Acknowledges and supports the Busconnects project which aims to improve public transport and address climate change in Dublin and other cities.
- The proposed scheme does not include any direct interactions with the national roads or light rail (Luas) networks.

## **3. Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage - DAU**

- The National Monument Service (NMS) has reviewed the EIAR and is broadly in agreement with the findings in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage.
- 4 no. conditions with respect to archaeology are recommended, they relate to:
  - Mitigation measures set out in the EIAR

- CEMP
- Project Archaeologist to be appointed.
- Archaeological monitoring and any investigation work / excavation required.

## **4.2. NTA Response to Prescribed Bodies**

### **1. Response to Dublin City Council**

- In its submission, DCC confirms policy support for the Proposed Scheme.
- The DCC submission concludes that the proposed scheme will contribute, and support continued improved integration of transport with land use planning and the delivery of improved high-capacity Core Bus Corridors will enable and support the delivery of both residential and economic development opportunities, facilitating the sustainable growth of Dublin City and its metropolitan area.
- The Traffic Section of DCC is supportive of the integrated sustainable transport proposals and recognises the significant improvements that they will bring in terms of safe cycling measures and in enabling an efficient public transportation service along these routes.
- The NTA notes that DCC state that a comprehensive EIAR is provided with the application documents examining the Proposed Scheme under all relevant impacts.
- The NTA notes that DCC state that the NIS submitted is generally satisfactory.
- Dublin City Council is satisfied that the elements of the proposed development which fall within the Council Boundary would not have any excessive or undue impact on the amenities of the area.

- The NTA acknowledges the positive and constructive liaison that has occurred with the DCC BusConnects Liaison Office throughout the design and planning process to date, and through that liaison office with the other Departments and Sections within DCC regarding the progression of the Proposed Scheme.
- The arrangement suggested by the City Archaeologist, as an alternative design for the proposed boardwalk, would not be preferable as it would intrude extensively into the common area of a private residential development with the loss of some car parking spaces, along with the taking in charge of the access to duplex apartments.
- The NTA will collaborate with Dublin City Council in relation to the provision of appropriate information panels at the Stone Boat.
- It will no longer be possible for pedestrians to have direct access to view the memorial plaque on the eastern parapet of Robert Emmet Bridge, as the existing footpath will be replaced by a cycle track, and pedestrians will use the adjoining new footbridge on the other side of the parapet. To compensate for this, an information board will be provided on the proposed new footbridge with a photograph of the plaque.
- At the abutments of Robert Emmet Bridge the new structures will be carefully integrated with the existing masonry wing walls so as to preserve as much as possible of the old structures.

A) Objection to proposed cycle routes through Poddle Park and Mount Argus Park.

This element of the submission relates to superseded proposals that had been included in an earlier stage of the Proposed Scheme. Following the non-statutory public consultations and submissions received with concerns about intrusions into these two small public parks, the scheme design was adjusted to omit those aspects, and the cycle routes were revised.

b) Lack of details in proposals – further engagement requested.

The NTA will continue to engage with all departments of Dublin City Council to address any concerns they may have about details of the Proposed Scheme.

c) Change some species of proposed trees to be planted and reduce numbers in certain places. NTA will continue to engage with Dublin City Council Parks, Biodiversity & Landscape Services to confirm the most suitable species of trees to be planted in the Proposed Scheme.

d) Setting for stone cross at north end of Harold's Cross Park to be enhanced.

In the Proposed Scheme the small footpath area at this location will be enhanced as much as possible within the constraints on a small traffic island in a signal-controlled junction.

- In the busiest parts of the route in Kimmage Village at the junction of Kimmage Road Lower with Sundrive Road, and at the Leonard's Corner junction of Clanbrassil Street with South Circular Road, the footpaths are generally about 3m wide, and wider in some places. In general, the footpaths along Clanbrassil Street Lower are unusually wide, especially north of Lombard Street West where the street was widened in the 1980's. However, there is a short 100m long section of the street between Vincent Street South and Lombard Street West with existing footpaths that are only 1.8m wide in places. This section of street is very constrained, and the footpaths could not be widened. In the proposed scheme the northbound bus lane has been omitted along this section. The cycle tracks will be reduced to 1.5m wide through this narrow section of street so as to fit in the limited space available between the existing kerbs, which will be retained. On this section of the Proposed Scheme all of the cross-section elements are at the minimum widths provided for under the relevant design standards, which is necessary due to the narrow width of the street.

- The NTA accepts the suggestion by DCC Architect's Division that an improved pedestrian crossing could be provided at the junction at the western end of the link street where it joins Kimmage Road Lower.
- NTA will continue to liaise with DCC in regard to public realm improvements in the detailed design stage.
- All CPO lands acquired by NTA for purposes of the Proposed Scheme will be transferred to the relevant local authority, upon completion of the proposed scheme.
- Bus shelters have been provided where practicable as part of the Proposed Scheme. The proposed bus stop shelters, as shown in the Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet for BusConnects, are of a high-quality design, constructed largely of glass panels with slimline stainlesssteel frames. They are discreet and highly transparent so as to have minimal visual impact on their surroundings. This type of bus shelter is widely used across Dublin and was designed for use in visually sensitive locations, including in proximity to protected structures and historic buildings. In this regard the DCC submission suggests potential negative impacts that will not arise.
- The NTA shares the concerns of DCC to minimise visual clutter along the core bus corridors.
- The Proposed Scheme is intended to provide enhanced facilities for public transport and active travel. It would not be appropriate in such a scheme to address the issue of on-street electrical charging facilities at parking spaces which is a separate matter for the local authority and the electrical supply utilities.
- NTA will continue the very positive and constructive liaison with DCC City Architects Department throughout the procurement and construction process

including in relation to the final detailing of footpath paving materials and new street furniture.

- To maintain the character and setting of the Proposed Scheme, the approach to undertaking the new boundary treatment works along the corridor is replacement on a 'like for like' basis in terms of material selection and general aesthetics unless otherwise noted on the drawings.
- A simple summary design statement for the proposed new footbridges beside Robert Emmet Bridge is provided in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 4, Section 4.5.3.8
- In designing the proposed new footbridges the structure was arranged to align carefully with the key features of the existing Robert Emmet Bridge, with a slim deck and glass parapets such that the old bridge will remain highly visible behind the new bridge.
- The separation between the proposed new footbridges and Robert Emmet Bridge is tightly constrained by the necessity to tie-in to the adjoining streets and junctions.
- As the deck will be perforated with an open grid to allow rain to fall through, as well as to provide visibility of the Stone Boat feature, there will be no shelter provided underneath. This situation would be most unlikely to attract anti-social behaviour for those reasons.
- The NTA will continue the very positive and constructive liaison with DCC City Architect's Department throughout the procurement and construction process including consideration of the provision of potential items of public art where appropriate.
- A localised section of the existing painted median will be removed at the junction with Mount Argus View where the junction will be upgraded to benefit pedestrians and cyclists.

- All heritage lamp standards have been identified in the Proposed Scheme and these will be retained where practicable and if they are in a suitable condition to be structurally safe or relocated in close proximity to their existing positions where necessary.
- There are few street trees along the Proposed Scheme, and none are of historic significance. In general, the Proposed Scheme intends to increase the number of street trees where possible and will provide new trees in numerous places to enhance the urban landscape. It will be necessary to remove a small number of existing trees where the road layout will be adjusted, but these are generally small specimens, and they will mostly be replaced by new trees to be planted in the same general area.
- If all of the existing masonry retaining wall materials were to be salvaged as requested by the City Archaeologist, this would require very difficult temporary works for a sheet pile wall to be installed behind the existing wall with associated closure of half of the public road, which would cause major disruption for all road users over a long period of time. Such an arrangement would not be practicable. Instead, it is proposed to face the new wall, along Clanbrassil Street Upper on the western side, with masonry similar to the old wall.
- Due to the constraints of a very busy urban road on a major radial route into Dublin City it will not be practicable to deconstruct this wall, on Clanbrassil Street upper, and to rebuild it several metres to the west. The upper parapet element will be salvaged and reconstructed in line with good conservation practice, which is as much as will be possible for this historic feature.
- The use of red coloured asphalt, or red coloured epoxy resin has been specified for all cycle tracks across the BusConnects Infrastructure Works to

ensure legibility and conspicuity of the proposed cycle tracks and to ensure safety for vulnerable road users.

- There are no gantry signs included in the Proposed Scheme.
- The Preliminary Design Report for the Proposed Scheme (Supplementary Information) in Table 4-2 details the widths of the road elements. Between Chainage A0+080 and A0+240 on the western side of the street the proposed footpath will be wider than 3m and can easily accommodate the proposed trees without impeding the effective footpath width. South of the junction with Larkfield Avenue in the Proposed Scheme new street trees will be provided in buildouts into the proposed parking bay outside of the 2m wide footpath.
- There is existing perpendicular parking on each side of the entrance to Mount Argus Church, which is retained in the Proposed Scheme, but with the addition of corner buildouts at the junction to better enclose the parking spaces.
- In the Proposed Scheme a new parking bay will be provided on the eastern side of Kimmage Road Lower south of the junction with Larkfield Avenue. This parking bay will be 2.3m wide as that is the maximum space that can be provided without narrowing the footpaths below 2m wide, or the traffic lanes below 3m wide, which are minimum widths in accordance with the design standards. Most cars are less than 2.4m wide, and if an occasional larger vehicle protrudes slightly into the road, this will be of little consequence on a road with low traffic volumes in a 30 km/h speed limit between the proposed bus gates.
- The access arrangement to the loading bay on Kimmage Road Lower at Harold's Cross will be accessed from the south only, as northbound traffic will be restricted at the proposed bus gate at the northern end of the street. Exit traffic from the bus gate can continue northwards through the bus gate before 6am and after 10am.



- The proposed small public car park is included in the Proposed Scheme as a replacement for existing on-street parking immediately nearby that will be removed for the provision of a cycle track. This car park will be on land acquired for the scheme and will become part of the public road under the control of Dublin City Council. The proposed car park at the hospice will operate like all other public parking in the area on the basis of pay and display for short stays with fairly high tariffs, and for local residents with permits.

A section of the existing access road into the hospice is included in the Compulsory Purchase Order for the Proposed Scheme and this will become a public road for access to the proposed new public car park. There will be a public right of way extending into the hospice campus from Harold's Cross Road to a proposed new gate at the western end of the CPO Plot. Access control to the hospice campus will be relocated to a new gate at the end of the new public road section. The section of the access road to the new hospice gate will be under the control of Dublin City Council as the road authority.

On Harold's Cross Road the public footpath and cycle track will continue across the entrance to the hospice and the proposed new car park. Vehicles will mount over kerb ramps to cross the cycle track and footpath. This is in accordance with the standards in the Design Manual for Urban Road and Streets (DMURS) and will become the norm at priority-controlled side streets in future. Examples of this arrangement have been recently retrofitted on side streets along the Clontarf to City Centre street improvement scheme that is under construction by Dublin City Council.

- The existing junction at Mount Drummond Avenue is excessively wide and longer than desirable for pedestrians to cross. In the Proposed Scheme, as shown in Figure 2-9-13, the junction will be narrowed and provided with a raised platform pedestrian crossing. This modification will make more space

available for landscape planting in a location with limited street trees. It will also enable provision of 2 additional new parking spaces on the southern side of the junction in a location with a severe shortage of parking. Because of the wide space available it is possible to provide two perpendicular parking spaces rather than just one parallel space. These parking spaces are set well back from the main road at the junction and can operate just like a driveway in terms of vehicle manoeuvres off and onto the street. NTA is satisfied that this proposal will operate safely and satisfactorily and does not share the concerns of DCC.

- In the Proposed Scheme there will be a minor reduction in the impermeable road area due to the introduction of a median island with trees along part of Kimmage Road Lower, which will slightly reduce the volume of road surface water that will drain to the River Poddle, and this will have a slight beneficial impact for water quality in that watercourse.
- NTA will continue the very positive and constructive liaison with Dublin City Council in relation to drainage matters prior to the construction stage of the Proposed Scheme.
- The NTA is aware of the presence of the existing drainage pipes in the middle of Kimmage Road Lower at this location, which are quite deep below ground. The proposed new trees will be planted in tree pits within a new median island, which will contain the roots of the trees and prevent them from extending too far below ground to potentially interfere with the drainage pipes passing below.
- In so far as is practicable the Proposed Scheme has included some minor bio-retention areas, but the scope is very limited in an existing street where there will be very little change in the overall impermeable area.

- DCC has set out a number of suggested conditions that An Bord Pleanála should attach to a planning consent. NTA provides responses to each of the proposed conditions.
- With respect to attachment of proposed conditions the NTA response regarding how the corridor is to be handed over sets out that the NTA intends to continue the close liaison with DCC that has been in place during the planning and design stage of the Proposed Scheme, during and throughout the subsequent construction stage. This will include engaging and collaborating on the construction arrangements, the road maintenance arrangements during construction and the standard to which the Proposed Scheme will be completed prior to transfer back to DCC, together with record retention, all in full accordance with the EIAR. Given the legislative framework that is in place, these are matters that can, and will, be successfully addressed between DCC and the NTA, in the absence of any approval condition.
- With respect to consultation with DCC departments into the final detailed design of the scheme. It is the intention of the NTA that this collaboration will continue both in advance of, and during, the subsequent construction stage of the Proposed Scheme. This will include continued liaison with the relevant sections of the Council and taking their requirements into consideration, where aligned with and consistent with the EIAR. These are matters that can be successfully addressed between DCC and the NTA, in the absence of any approval condition.

## 2. Response to DAU

- As part of the EIAR, a CEMP has been prepared for the Proposed Scheme and is included as Appendix A5.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR. The CEMP will be

updated by the NTA prior to finalising the Construction Contract documents for tender, so as to include any additional measures required pursuant to conditions attached to An Bord Pleanála's decision. The CEMP comprises the construction mitigation measures, which are set out in the EIAR and NIS. All of the measures set out in this CEMP will be implemented in full by the appointed contractor and its finalisation will not affect the robustness and adequacy of the information presented and relied upon in the EIAR and NIS. Chapter 15 in Volume 2 of the EIAR sets out the archaeological baseline in which the Proposed Scheme is located, assesses the potential for archaeological impacts as a result of the Proposed Scheme and sets out the mitigation measures which will be implemented.

- It is the intention of the NTA that liaison continues with the relevant bodies including the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage and the conservation departments of SDCC / DCC in advance of, and during, the subsequent construction stage of the Proposed Scheme.

3. Response to TII

Transport Infrastructure Ireland has no specific submissions to make in relation to the Proposed Scheme.

Noted.

**4.3. DCC Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

DCC responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:

Architecture Section:

- DCC is supportive and recognises the significant improvement the proposed core bus corridor scheme (the Scheme) will bring to the City's active travel and public transport infrastructure by connecting the southwest suburbs with the City Centre. The Scheme will deliver a much-needed quality and frequent public transport route of the overall Bus Connect network and improve connections between communities.
- From a strategic point of view, the Scheme will contribute to meeting the objectives of the National Planning Framework (NPF) and Climate Action Plan (CAP) by contributing to the provision of high quality integrated public transport services which will support growing communities, businesses, and future development. In turn, this will effectively promote the modal shift from the private car towards more sustainable forms of transport including walking, cycling and public transport, ultimately contributing to the creation of a greener and more sustainable city.
- If the footpath, adjacent to the park is to be removed as proposed then it is recommended that the existing path running parallel in the park be upgraded in consultation with the Parks Department, DCC. All existing historic kerbs are to be retained and re-used within the scheme area.
- The NTA's proposal to continue to liaise with DCC regarding public realm improvements in the detailed design stage is welcomed by the City Architects Division.
- Consultation with the Roads Maintenance Division DCC is required for lands to be transferred to DCC to ensure that all works undertaken comply with the DCC standards for road and street works.
- This is an opportunity to discontinue the practice of placing advertisement panels in the vicinity of Protected structures and Architectural Conservation Areas.

- The NTA's proposal to continue to liaise with DCC regarding the selection of paving materials and street furniture in the detailed design stage is welcomed by the City Architects Division.
- The City Architects Division would welcome further engagement with the NTA at the detailed design stage with respect to boundary replacement treatments.
- The City Architects Division would welcome further engagement with the NTA at the detailed design stage of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk.
- The Dublin City Council Arts Office and City Architects Division will welcome liaising with the NTA on proposals for the Percent for Art Scheme and Village Signage as part of the Busconnects project.

Conservation Section:

- The response by the NTA in relation to the DCC Conservation Section submission is generally satisfactory save Item No. 2 - Masonry wall on Clanbrassil Street Upper.
- Additionally, the Conservation Section raised concerns in relation to the impact of the proposals to construct new cycle/pedestrian bridges to the east and west of Harold's Cross Bridge, but the NTA has not responded directly to the concerns raised by the Conservation Section, although it is noted that some response has been provided to the concerns raised by City Architects and the City Archaeology section in relation to same.
- DCC Conservation Section reiterates their proposed mitigation measures in relation to the masonry walls at Clanbrassil Street.
- DCCs Conservation Section reiterate their proposed mitigation measures in relation to the Emmet Bridge at Harold's Cross.

Conservation Conditions:

1. To safeguard the special architectural interest of affected Architectural Heritage across the Bus Connects routes - including Protected Structures and Conservation Areas, landscaping, historic paving, setts, kerbing and associated features, boundary treatments, historic street furniture, gardens and trees and historic public realm etc. - and to ensure that the proposed works will be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice with no unauthorised or unnecessary damage or loss of historic fabric, the Conservation Section recommend that all works shall be designed and supervised by an expert in architectural conservation in accordance with the provisions (outlined above) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and relevant documents of the DHLGH Advice Series.
2. The conservation professional shall ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the proposed works and across all preparatory and construction phases. In this regard, all works shall be designed to cause minimum interference to historic fabric.
3. In accordance with best conservation practice, specifications and method statements for the careful and sensitive relocation and reinstatement of historic fabric identified in the report above, and in particular to Protected Structures, sites/structures on the NIAH and DCIHR, and structures and features in Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs) across the Bus Connects route shall be submitted by the conservation professional for the written approval of the Planning Authority in advance of works commencing.

4. The conservation professional shall advise the Conservation Section on architectural heritage and conservation matters that may have further impacts on the project throughout the construction phases.

5. If, through the course of construction work across the Bus Connects routes, hitherto unknown and concealed architectural heritage fabric is found, the conservation professional shall contact the Conservation Section to advise them of the discovery as the presence of historic fabric may inform an alternative strategy for a design proposal that would enhance the setting of a Protected Structure, other historic buildings and features, an Architectural Conservation Area or Conservation Area.

6. All works shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice, the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the Advice Series issued by the Department of the Housing, Local Government and Heritage. All repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ. Items to be removed for repair off-site shall be recorded before removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic reinstatement.

7. All existing original architectural heritage features, in the vicinity of the works shall be protected during the course of all phases of construction works.

8. All repairs of historic fabric shall be scheduled and carried out by appropriately experienced conservators of historic fabric.

9. The Conservation Section recommends the following specific measures:



a) A redesigned scheme at Robert Emmet Bridge that is of higher architectural quality than the submitted proposal and that would lessen the physical and visual impact on the historic masonry bridge shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority in advance of works commencing. New work and materials should be of the highest possible architectural quality, should complement the historic features of the bridge and should be legible as new interventions. This redesign shall be informed by a revised architectural heritage impact assessment, by a suitably qualified conservation professional, providing detailed design information and outlining the nature and likely impacts of the proposed bridge extension.

b) The concealment burial of historic walls at Clanbrassil Street Upper is not appropriate. The Conservation Section recommends that in lieu of burial, the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric is carefully lifted and reinstated in its new location in accordance with best conservation principles. The historic fabric shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic reinstatement. Where new construction is proposed, all new work and materials should be of the highest possible architectural quality and should complement the historic features of the wall.

c) A redesign of the scheme at Clanbrassil Street Upper to lessen the physical and visual impact on the historic masonry walls shall be submitted for the written approval of the Planning Authority in advance of works commencing. The redesign shall be informed by a revised architectural heritage impact assessment, by a suitably qualified conservation professional, providing detailed design information and outlining the nature and likely impacts of the proposed demolition and subsequent replacement of the walls.

d) Full details of the design, type and location of each bus shelter/ stop along the proposed route in front of Protected Structures and structures on the NIAH shall be submitted to and agreed upon in writing with the Planning Authority in advance of works commencing.

e) The Conservation Section recommends the omission of bus shelters in front of and in the immediate vicinity of Protected Structures across the route and for bus stops only to be considered at these locations, in order to minimise visual clutter and protect the special architectural character of Protected Structures. This shall be confirmed in writing to the Planning Authority in advance of works commencing.

f) Consideration should be given to the rationalisation of all traffic infrastructure such as signage, traffic poles, utility boxes etc. across the route to reduce visual clutter, in particular in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within Architectural Conservation Areas, red-hatched conservation areas and in residential conservation areas.

g) The Conservation Section recommends the omission of cantilevered signal poles in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within Conservation Areas, red hatched conservation areas and residential conservation areas and alternative traffic signalling solutions should be sought.

h) Consideration should be given to the omission of gantry traffic signage in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within Architectural Conservation Areas, red-hatched conservation areas and residential conservation areas and alternative traffic signage solutions should be sought.

i) Where cycleways are located near Protected Structures and within Conservation Areas generally, the Conservation Section recommends the use of alternative high-quality cycle lane surfaces in lieu of red tarmacadam.

j) The alignment of footpaths should respect the setting of Protected Structures and buildings of National importance.

Environment Protection Division:

- DCC acknowledges that the proposed Scheme was developed largely in line with the design principles as outlined by ourselves, we did point out specific locations where we felt this was not done adequately and we expect these to be addressed in accordance with the policies of Dublin City Council. In particular, we expect all drainage infrastructure provided to comply with the requirements of the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works (Ver. 6) unless specific derogations are sought and agreed upon.
- The issue of ongoing maintenance of the corridor to ensure that the corridor can be maintained in such a manner as to keep the level of Public Transport priority has still not been addressed and needs to form part of the scheme.

Park Biodiversity and Landscape Services Division.

- Note response to proposed cycle routes through Poddle Park and Mount Argus Park.
- Further engagement requested with regard to lack of detail in proposals.
- Welcome the commitment to continue to liaise with DCC Parks, Biodiversity & Landscape Services with the detailed design development of the Bus Connects

Scheme. To ensure that the liaison is completed to DCC's satisfaction we require that the requested planning conditions, including Condition 3 - retention of a Landscape Architect Consultant and Condition 4 - retention of an Arboriculturist, are included within the permission grant.

- We recommend that a Tree Bond be agreed upon with the DCC Parks Landscape and Biodiversity Section for each proposed retained tree within the permission grant.
- Although the NTA has responded to other concerns about the removal of the footpath made by the DCC Traffic Section in Section 2.9 and by concerns raised by others in Section 2.5.4, there is no response/commentary on the specific concerns raised by DCC Parks, Biodiversity & Landscape Services. The construction works required to create the wider roadway and the effect of the traffic load on the root system of the trees along the southern boundary present a considerable risk to these trees. There has been no survey undertaken for these trees - presumably as the original scheme for Kimmage Bus Corridor did not contain the removal of the footpath.
- The rationale for the removal of the footpath seems very weak - the existing layout has operated successfully with no issues with two-way traffic utilising this short section of road. The intent of removing the footpath is to speed up traffic along this section of road. This will put park users at risk with faster traffic and reduced landing areas to the two park entrances to the road - NTA in their responses have rejected the provision of additional pedestrian crossings to this section of road or to Harolds Cross Road or Kimmage Road - which will further increase the risk to park users.

- DCC Parks, Biodiversity & Landscape Services additionally note that the park is only accessible to the public during daylight hours. NTA is proposing that the park operate as a pedestrian route to replace the footpath - this can only happen during the summer months. As the route is well used by children attending Harolds Cross Educate Together Junior and Secondary Schools and by St Clares Junior School - DCC Parks would note that the park does not provide a safe access route for much of the year.
- DCC Parks, Biodiversity & Landscape Services raised a number of general and specific queries in the original submission - we are in agreement with the NTA that in general these can be addressed as part of the design development phase of the project and that design details, construction requirements, tree protection, etc. can be reviewed and agreed between DCC Parks, Biodiversity & Landscape Services and the NTA's Landscape Architect and Arboriculturist. Items include detailed layouts which clearly show services and lighting, method statements for works, and Construction and Maintenance specifications.
- The residual visual impact associated with the proposed footbridges at Robert Emmett Bridge stated within the EIAR is inaccurate. The visual impact is considered unacceptable and these elements should be omitted from the proposals until an appropriate solution is available.

#### **4.4. Third Party Observations**

84 no. third party submissions have been received and are summarised within Appendix 1 of this report, 7 of which have requested an Oral Hearing. The PA's

submission and prescribed bodies are additional. In the interest of conciseness, I refer the Board to this appendix should they wish to examine individual submissions. In relation to the content of the submissions it is of note that many issues raised are common to all of the submissions. For example:

- Many submissions welcome the proposed scheme.
- Concern of proposed Bus Gates:
  - Welcomed by some people.
  - Objected to in some submissions because of reduced accessibility by car to R817 Kimmage Road Lower.
  - Concern of combined impacts for traffic management changes across several corridors were highlighted, particularly in regard to potential severance of communities east of R817 Kimmage Road Lower.
  - General query about the legality of bus lane provisions and whether taxis may use what appear to be 'contra-flow' bus lanes in some places.
  - Times of operation to be clarified with access for large delivery vehicles.
  - Access to amenities (including emergency access to schools and hospitals) and members of the community within the Bus Gate; and
  - Access for funerals at Mount Jerome during the late morning and early afternoon.
- Concern of traffic impacts on Clareville Road (particularly regarding school drop offs) and other alternative routes.
- Concern and support of The Poddle Cycleway proposals at Mount Argus connecting to Sundrive Road. Concerns in relation to risks for security and anti-social behaviour.

- Requests for more street trees and public realm improvements along R137 Harold's Cross Road.
- Concern of proposal to replace the existing cycle lanes on R817 Kimmage Road Lower at Sundrive Cross, with on-street parking.
- Concern cycle tracks are not high quality.
- Concern of the extent of public realm proposals at Sundrive Cross, loss of parking and the potential CPO of private landing areas.
- The concept of urban realm improvements is welcomed, but the extent is questioned.
- Concern is raised of speeding. A 30 km/h (kilometre per hour) speed limit has been suggested for much of the route including R137 Harold's Cross Road. Suggestions for traffic calming and pedestrian crossings are outlined.
- R817 Kimmage Road Lower at KCR / Hazelbrook / Ravensdale: Suggested improvements for footpaths, cycle tracks and local traffic access restrictions. Coordination with the proposed flood defence scheme.
- Concern of narrow footpaths at R817 Kimmage Road Lower opposite Ravensdale and at Harold's Cross Park.
- Concern is raised of increased noise and air pollution.
- Concern is raised of prematurity of works due to COVID-19, and preference for the MetroLink project.
- Concern is raised of Bus stops being moved.
- Concern is raised of reduced frequency of public transport along the corridor; and
- Concern is raised about the non-statutory consultation process.

4.5. In addition to the foregoing the major issues raised in the various third-party submissions to the Board are summarised under broad headings below:

- No Strategic Environmental Assessment for the overall BusConnects Programme.
- Limited proposals for landscaping and biodiversity are welcome but should be more extensive.
- Provision of new car parking is contrary to DCC and national planning policies by encouraging car use.
- Roads too narrow to fit layout and no dimensions on maps.
- Concern no consideration of what happens buses in the City Centre.
- Query the reliability of the traffic modelling, data counts and up to date nature of the information.
- Concern of traffic safety, redistribution of traffic to surrounding roads, congestion for local residents, longer journey times, impact upon emergency vehicles, loss of on-street car parking.
- Concern of congestion, noise and pollution, anti-climate change.
- Concern of loss of trees and impact upon Harolds Cross Park, Robert Emmet Bridge and Stoneboat built heritage.
- Concern of impact upon biodiversity and wildlife systems.
- Concern of impact upon mobility impaired and elderly, footpaths too narrow, bus stops relocated inappropriately, non-continuous segregated cycle track and narrow width of cycle track.
- Concern of introduction of 4 Bus Gates and Turn bans.
- Concern of impact upon Kimmage village.



- Concern urban realm improvements and paving is not to sufficient high standard.
- Concern of impact upon businesses, community, schools, hospitals, services and amenities.
- Concern of flawed / inadequate public consultation and contravention of Aarhus Convention.
- Concern of impact upon property values.
- Concerns raised with respect to the proposed construction compound K3 on the green area to the front of Grenville Place.
- Concern of loss of loading bays in Kimmage Village and on Clanbassil Street.
- Concern of proposed cycle route from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Estate.
- Lack of public consultation
- Request oral hearing
- Pre-COVID traffic volumes used in analysis
- Alternative options not considered.

4.6. More specific concerns raised by individual groups along the proposed alignment included the following:

- Dublin Commuter Coalition, supports Busconnects project, however, raises issue of enforcement and enforcement cameras, continuous provision of 24/7 bus lane operation, concern of two stage pedestrian crossings, junction design for cyclists, Bus stops design, missing pedestrian crossings, no segregation

for cycle tracks in several places, shared space and quantum of bicycle parking.

- Dublin Cycling Campaign, raise issues with respect to National Mobility Policy targets, adherence to universal design, welcome design interventions - improved island bus stops, raise issue with regard to bus gate operating hours, cycle track widths, cycle track continuity, filtered permeability, quiet street treatment and speed limits.
- Local businesses, raise issues with respect to loss of trade, impact and location of protected cycle lanes, loss of loading bays and impact upon access, deliveries, safety of vulnerable pedestrians and cyclists.
- Access to amenities and services in particular, Mount Jerome Cemetery, Our Lady's Hospice and Care Services, Religious Sisters of Charity, Tesco Ireland, Capital Glass Company Limited, Mullen Scrap (Dawnlane), Halal Food and Grocery, Gordon's Fuels, Larkview Football Club, The Wine Pair, and Thom's Pharmacy and Opticians.

4.7. It is important to note at this juncture that third parties were invited to respond to the applicant's response to their submissions. A total of 32 valid additional submissions were received. I note there is a lot of support for the project. Numerous submissions support improved and additional bicycle lanes, improving public transport supporting environmentally sensitive transport solutions and positive climate change. However, numerous submissions also state that the NTA's response is insufficient to address concerns raised, there is concern an Oral Hearing was not held, they reiterate concerns of misleading modelling, out of date data and data analysis. Concern is expressed of how buses will traverse through the city centre and not conflict with DCC transport plans. I note specific concerns are raised with respect to:

- The proposed inclusion of 4 no. Busgates, hours of operation and impact to surrounding roads and local residential community.
- Removal of a wall and inclusion of the proposed cycle path from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Estate – off route cycle way / quiet street.
- Impact of the proposed Boardwalk on the Stone Boat feature.
- Proposed removal of the footpath south of Harolds Cross Park.
- Impact upon archaeology of Robert Emmett Bridge.
- Proposed location of Construction Compounds, in particular, K2 and K3.
- Bollards proposed to close Derravaragh Road and Corrib Road, to general traffic, are unsightly, unnecessary and have a negative impact for residents.
- Proposed parking at 169 – 199 Lower Kimmage Road to facilitate businesses is contrary to the aims and objectives of the scheme.
- Proposed car parking and construction compound (K2) at Our Lady's Hospice and Care Service.
- Removal of a loading Bay at Tesco Express on South Circular Road.
- Location of bus stops on Clanbrassil street, where the road is narrow and too close to property entrance.
- Impact upon properties at Clanbrassil Street Upper, inter alia, at 32A Gordon's Fuels, 31 Clanbrassil Street at Dawnlane / Mullens Scrap and to No. 61A and 62 Clanbrassil Street, Capital Glass Co. Limited.

4.8. It is important to note that all relevant issues raised are considered in detail under the specific headings within my report hereunder.

#### **4.9. NTA Response to submissions**

The NTA submitted a response to the submissions raised which can be summarised hereunder. It is of note that as outlined above a significant number of submissions are similar in nature and are concerned with the same issues, such as no Strategic Environmental Assessment for the overall BusConnects Programme, limited proposals for landscaping and biodiversity, provision of new car parking is contrary to DCC and national planning policies by encouraging car use, roads are too narrow to fit layout and there are inadequate dimensions on maps. In the interest of conciseness rather than list every submission and repeat the same response I will summarise the response based on topic and where there are standalone issues raised I will refer to the particular submission and summarise the response accordingly.

Query the need and justification for the project.

- 4.9.1. The NTA has outlined the need for the proposed scheme stating that: The key radial traffic routes into and out of Dublin City Centre are characterised by poor bus and cycle infrastructure in places. Effective and reliable bus priority depends on a combination of continuous bus lanes and signal control priority at pinch-points and junctions. Currently, bus lanes are available for approximately 18% of the route, with no signal control priority for buses. Cyclists must typically share space in bus lanes or general traffic lanes as there are only very limited lengths of segregated cycle tracks (which have temporary plastic kerbs and bollards). Furthermore, there are key sections of the current bus lanes that are not operational on a 24-hour basis in addition to being shared with both formal and informal parking facilities and cyclists which compromises the reliability and effectiveness of the bus services in these areas.

- 4.9.2. Private car dependence has resulted in significant congestion that has impacted on quality of life, the urban environment and road safety. The population of the Greater Dublin Area (GDA) is projected to rise by 25% by 2040 (National Planning Framework, 2018), reaching almost 1.5 million. This growth in population will increase demand for travel necessitating improved sustainable transport options to facilitate this growth.
- 4.9.3. Without intervention, traffic congestion will lead to longer and less reliable bus journeys throughout the region and will affect the quality of people's lives. The Proposed Scheme is needed in order to enable and deliver efficient, safe, and integrated sustainable transport movement along the corridor through the provision of enhanced walking, cycling and bus infrastructure on this key access corridor in the Dublin region.
- 4.9.4. It is indicated by the applicant that the impact of the reduction in general traffic flows along the route will be a Positive, Slight to Profound and Long-Term effect whilst the impact of the redistributed general traffic along the surrounding road network will have a Negative, Slight and Long-term effect. Thus, it is contended overall, there will be no significant deterioration in the general traffic environment in the study area as a consequence of meeting the scheme objectives of providing enhanced sustainable mode priority along the direct study area.
- 4.9.5. The proposal has been justified in terms of bus journey times and climate change impacts. The NTA submit that the Proposed Scheme will deliver average inbound journey time savings for F1 service bus passengers of c7.4 minutes (32%) in 2028 and c5.4 minutes (26%) in 2043. The Proposed Scheme is expected to deliver bus journey time savings in the AM and PM peaks. The most notable savings can be seen on the Kimmage Road Lower approach to the Sundrive Road crossroads and on the Harold's Cross Road approach to the Grand Canal. In both cases, the

introduction of bus lanes up to the stop line and the separate phasing of previously conflicting movements can be shown to deliver benefits.

- 4.9.6. The Proposed Scheme will deliver average outbound journey time savings for F1 service bus passengers of up to c. 2.8 minutes (16%) in 2028 (PM) and c. 1.8 minutes (11%) in 2043 (PM). The most notable savings can be seen in the PM peak on the Clanbrassil Street Lower approach to the South Circular Road Junction (Leonard's Corner) and the Clanbrassil Street Upper approach to Windsor Terrace (Grand Canal). In both cases, the introduction of bus lanes up to the junction stop line can be seen to offer journey time and reliability savings versus the Do Minimum.
- 4.9.7. The NTA submit that the Proposed Scheme will reduce total bus journey times along the Proposed Scheme by up to 26% in 2028 and 23% in 2043. Based on the AM and PM peak hours alone, this equates to c. 6.3 hours of savings in 2028 and 4.8 hours in 2043 combined across all buses when compared to the Do Minimum. On an annual basis this equates to approximately 4,700 hours of bus vehicle savings in 2028 and 3,600 hours in 2043, when considering weekday peak periods only.
- 4.9.8. The proposed scheme will also support the delivery of government strategies outlined in the 2024 CAP and the 2015 Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act (As amended) by enabling sustainable mobility and delivering a sustainable transport system.

Reliability of the traffic modelling, data counts and up to date nature of the information.

- 4.9.9. The NTA notes the comments raised in relation to the traffic modelling and the presentation of the associated data. It is submitted that Chapter 21 of the EIAR assesses the cumulative Impact of the construction of all 12 Core Bus Corridor schemes, including the Kimmage to City Centre CBC Scheme, the Templeogue/Rathfarnham CBC Scheme and the Tallaght/Clondalkin to City Centre

CBC Scheme. Cumulative traffic impacts are also set out in the Traffic Impact Assessment Report in Appendix A6.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

- 4.9.10. Due to the scale of the BusConnects Infrastructure programme, it was necessary to utilise two separate traffic count surveyors. Because of this, the presentation of data presented for schemes on the northside of the city, is not exactly the same as the presentation of data for schemes on the southside of the city. Notwithstanding this, the same data was collected and analysed in designing and assessing the proposed scheme as was for the other schemes. The raw traffic data has been shared with the public as background information to the planning application. Section 6.2.5.2.2 of Chapter 6 of the EIAR notes the following in relation to the traffic counts undertaken: “Due to the scale of the CBC Infrastructure Works, the proposed scheme required a full set of consistent updated traffic counts for a neutral period e.g. November / February when schools, colleges were in session. Traffic surveys were undertaken in November 2019 and February 2020 (Pre-Covid) with the surveyed counts used as inputs to the model calibration and validation process of the strategic model and micro-simulation model. The two types of counts used in the study are Junction Turning Counts (JTCs) and Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs).”
- 4.9.11. Section 6.2.3 of Chapter 6 of the EIAR sets out the extensive modelling exercise carried out in developing and assessing the Proposed Scheme. There are four tiers of transport modelling which have been used to assess the impacts of the Proposed Scheme:
- Tier 1 (Strategic Level): The NTA’s East Regional Model (ERM) is the primary tool which has been used to undertake the strategic modelling of the Proposed Scheme and has provided the strategic multi-modal demand outputs for the proposed forecast years;

- Tier 2 (Local Level): A Local Area Model (LAM) has been developed to provide a more detailed understanding of traffic movement at a local level. The LAM is a subset model created from the ERM and contains a more refined road network model used to provide consistent road-based outputs to inform the TIA, EIA and junction design models. This includes information such as road network speed data and traffic redistribution impacts for the Operational Phase. The LAM also provides traffic flow information for the micro-simulation model and junction design models and has been used to support junction design and traffic management plan testing.
- Tier 3 (Corridor Level): A micro-simulation model of the full 'end to end' corridor has been developed for the Proposed Scheme. The primary role of the micro-simulation model has been to support the ongoing development of junction designs and traffic signal control strategies and to provide bus journey time information for the determination of benefits of the Proposed Scheme; and
- Tier 4 (Junction Level): Local junction models have been developed, for each junction along the Proposed Scheme to support local junction design development. These models are informed by the outputs from the above modelling tiers, as well as the junction designs which are, as discussed above, based on people movement prioritisation."

4.9.12. A large number of figures are included in Chapter 6 of the EIAR to demonstrate the transport modelling carried out, and the NTA is satisfied that modelling and presentation of results is in line with best practice industry standards.

4.9.13. The NTA notes that the approach adopted in assessing and presenting the information is in line with TII's Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines (May 2014). This document is considered best practice guidance for the assessment of



transport impacts related to changes in traffic flows due to proposed developments and is an appropriate means of assessing the impact of general traffic trip redistribution on the surrounding road network.

- 4.9.14. It is submitted that the design of the scheme was an iterative process and responded to constraints and requirements that were added to the models overtime. Models were calibrated to account for the difference between modelled and observed traffic flows which improved the accuracy of the outcomes of the proposed route.

Alternatives Options Not Considered.

- 4.9.15. Some third parties have raised concerns in relation to the overall justification of the Proposed Scheme in terms of alternative proposals which should be prioritised in lieu of the works (e.g. DART upgrades), and whether the works are justified in light of the new working environment in a post-COVID era.
- 4.9.16. The NTA submit that the appropriate type of public transport provision in any particular case is predominately determined by the likely quantum of passenger demand along the particular public transport route. With this in mind the applicant considered the option of constructing a light rail service which would cater for a passenger demand of between 3,500 and 7,000 per hour per direction (inbound and outbound journeys). Based on the number of passengers predicted to use the new service, it was considered that there would be insufficient demand to justify a light rail option. The light rail option would also require significantly more land take, necessitating the demolition of properties.
- 4.9.17. Metro alternative was also considered and as there is a higher capacity requirement for such solutions, generally designed for peak hour passenger numbers exceeding about 7,000 passengers per hour per direction, it was deemed not suitable for this route. In addition, the development of an underground metro would not remove the

need for additional infrastructure to serve the residual bus needs of the area covered by the proposed scheme.

- 4.9.18. Heavy rail alternatives carry in excess of 10,000 people each direction each hour and was considered an unsuitable solution.
- 4.9.19. Demand management in the form of restricting car movement or car access through regulatory signage and access prohibitions, to parking restrictions and fiscal measures (such as tolls, road pricing, congestion charging, fuel/vehicle surcharges and similar) were all considered as alternatives to the proposed scheme. However, it is stated that in the case of Dublin, the existing public transport system does not currently have sufficient capacity to cater for large volumes of additional users, such measures would not work in isolation to address car journeys into and out of the city and would not encourage people onto alternative modes.
- 4.9.20. Whilst technological alternatives are becoming increasingly advanced, the use of electric vehicles does not address congestion problems and the need for mass transit.

No Strategic Environmental Assessment for the overall BusConnects Programme.

- 4.9.21. The NTA submit that the Proposed Scheme, the BusConnects Programme is part of the range of proposed improvements for the public transport system that was adopted under the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy (2016-2035 & 2022–2042).
- 4.9.22. As set out in Section 2.2.1.2 of Chapter 2, Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA), were undertaken for both GDA Transport Strategies:

“A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was undertaken on the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016 – 2035 (NTA 2016b). A number of alternative strategies were determined and assessed, taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the strategy. The provisions of the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016 – 2035 (including bus-based transport modes), were evaluated for potential significant effects, and measures integrated into the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016 – 2035 on foot of SEA recommendations in order to ensure that potential adverse effects were mitigated. In considering the alternative modes on a corridor basis, the environmental assessment undertaken considered that bus-based projects could contribute towards facilitating the achievement of Ireland’s greenhouse gas emission targets in terms of reducing emissions per passenger per kilometre travelled. An SEA was also undertaken for the new Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022 – 2042 (NTA 2022b).”

- 4.9.23. In the event that there is any suggestion that this Scheme, namely the Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme, itself should have been the subject of an SEA, that is not correct. A plan or programme is required to be the subject of a SEA under the provisions of the SEA Directive 7 whereas a project is required to be the subject of EIA under the EIA Directive. Any of the individual stand-alone Core Bus Corridor Schemes is not a plan or programme within the meaning of the SEA Directive, requiring the carrying out of SEA.

Limited proposals for landscaping and biodiversity are welcome but should be more extensive.

- 4.9.24. The NTA submits that the Proposed Scheme has been developed carefully to integrate with the existing landscaping and park areas along the corridor. Where

there is scope within the constraints of the existing urban context, the Proposed Scheme incorporates significant new landscaping consisting of additional street trees at many locations, including a tree lined median island over a length of 170m on Kimmage Road Lower in the Corrib Road area, urban realm improvements along 300m length of streets in Kimmage Village, and various other pockets of new planting and trees at intervals along the route. In this respect the Proposed Scheme has maximised the potential for further greening of this urban corridor which will enhance the biodiversity of the general area.

Provision of new car parking is contrary to DCC and national planning policies by encouraging car use.

- 4.9.25. There NTA acknowledges that there will be a slight reduction in car parking in the overall scheme as is described in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport, Tables 6-22, 6-27 and 6-32. In Section 1 the parking will reduce by 5% from 760 to 721 spaces; in Section 2 parking will increase by 15% from 78 to 90 spaces; and in Section 3 parking will reduce by 9.5% from 199 to 180 spaces.
- 4.9.26. Overall, the parking along the whole of the Proposed Scheme will reduce by 4.4% from 1,037 spaces, with a net reduction of 46 spaces. The reductions in parking occur in the Sections with the greatest number of spaces, and are proportionally modest, while in Section 2 which has the least amount of parking and a general shortage in an area where very few houses have driveways, a small increase is proposed so as to diminish the risk of irregular parking on the proposed cycle tracks.
- 4.9.27. The overall significance of effect is assessed as Negative, Slight and Long-Term in each of the three sections. It is submitted that it cannot be reasonably considered that the Proposed Scheme is contrary to DCC and national planning policies by encouraging car use in respect of the impact for parking which will actually be

reduced slightly, while the key outcomes of the Proposed Scheme will be to provide significant improvements for public transport and cycling infrastructure.

Roads too narrow to fit layout and no dimensions on maps.

- 4.9.28. The NTA submit that the narrowness of Kimmage Road Lower, in particular, is a key feature of the Proposed Scheme, which is why bus priority is proposed to be provided by bus gates rather than bus lanes over the southern 2km length of the corridor. In the EIAR Chapter 3 Alternatives and Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Scheme it is explained for each section the choices that were necessary to fit the proposed street layout within the constraints of the existing road widths. In some respects, it was necessary to reduce the widths of some elements of the road cross-section to fit in the limited space available. An example is for the cycle tracks along Harold's Cross Road and part of Clanbrassil Street Lower which will be 1.5m wide rather than the desirable 2m width.
- 4.9.29. The NTA submit that dimensions of the proposed road layout could not be shown on the General Arrangement Drawings (EIAR Volume 3 Figures, Part 2) as this was impractical. Typical cross sections with dimensions are provided in EIAR Volume 3 Figures, Part 4, and detailed dimensions for both the existing road layout and the proposed layout are tabulated in the Supplementary Information, Preliminary Design Report, Table 4-2.

Public Consultation

- 4.9.30. A number of submissions raised concerns in relation to the quality of consultation and communication with residents. Three rounds of consultation were undertaken with a number of methods used including:

- Dedicated website,
  - Brochure for the development,
  - Public information events – in person for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> round and virtual for 3<sup>rd</sup>.
  - Public representatives' engagement,
  - Community forum events with representatives of the community – in persons for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> and virtual for 3<sup>rd</sup>.
  - Social media coverage,
  - Papers,
  - Press and radio
  - Emails, and Freephone service and Post Channels
  - Outdoor advertising,
  - Presentations and infographics
- First non-statutory round of public consultation took place from February 2019 to May 2019. The Preferred Route Option (PRO) non-statutory public consultation took place from 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020 to 17<sup>th</sup> April 2020. The public were invited to make written submissions in relation to the published proposals to the BusConnects Infrastructure team either through an online form, by email or by post. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic all further planned events scheduled after 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020 were postponed. A third round of public consultation took place from 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020 to 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020. This third round was carried out using virtual consultation rooms, offering a 'call-back' facility along with descriptions, supporting documentation and mapping of the draft PRO as well

as information on all revisions, if any, made since the PRO non-statutory public consultation.

4.9.31. As part of the scheme development stage, various non-statutory public consultation processes have been undertaken. These processes are in excess of the requirements of the Aarhus Convention, whose obligations are already enshrined in Irish legislation including “statutory public consultations” which is the stage that the project has now reached.

4.9.32. Over the course of the engagements, affected property owners have had the opportunity to discuss, among other things, the following aspects with the BusConnects Infrastructure team:

- Overall scheme proposals and potential impacts;
- Timelines for the scheme design development and associated EIAR assessment;
- Procedural matters such as planning and CPO process;
- Specific details of impact of scheme on landowner property including approximate extent of encroachment; and
- General information around reinstatement and accommodation works.

4.9.33. The NTA notes that the fees payable for observations / submissions are determined by An Bord Pleanála, as allowed by Section 144 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

4.9.34. The NTA submits the comment regarding the technical nature and volume of the documents presenting a potential barrier to the general public seeking access to information relating to the scheme. It is responded that given the nature of such infrastructure schemes as BusConnects Core Bus Corridors, there is invariably a substantial amount of technical information which needs to be provided, so as to

ensure that the consent application is comprehensive in nature to meet legislative requirements and provide the competent authority with the necessary information to allow them to reach a decision. Volume 1 of the EIAR comprises the Non-Technical Summary of the EIAR for the Proposed Scheme. Chapter 1 in Volume 2 of the EIAR contains information on the content and structure of the EIAR. Section 1.5.6 of Chapter 1 sets out the information which must be contained in the EIAR. The NTA has sought to make the information as concise as possible, while ensuring that the necessary information has been provided. Section 1.5.7 of Chapter 1 sets out the structure of the EIAR. It is considered that the structure of the EIAR does provide the necessary legibility for those interested parties (both lay persons and technical specialists) to find the information of relevance to them.

- 4.9.35. Site Notices No.1 at Poddle Park and at No.2 Derravaragh Road that were initially installed on 27<sup>th</sup> of July 2023 contained incorrect maps. These errors were rectified with new Site Notices erected on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2023. The statutory public consultation period was extended to 8<sup>th</sup> of December to allow a full 7 weeks' period after the notices had been corrected. The overall total public consultation period for the Proposed Scheme therefore amounted to 4 months.
- 4.9.36. It is not usual practice for a public body such as NTA to provide funding for professional advice to community groups engaged in consultation for a proposed public works scheme.

#### Monitoring of scheme in operation and ongoing community engagement

- 4.9.37. The submission by the Lower Kimmage Road Residents' Association requests:  
"Monitoring should be continuous and reporting with opportunities for consultation (at least annually), transparent and consequential, with criteria to be mutually agreed



under an independent Chair. This might be done across the breadth of Bus Connects as a substantial change for the city but should allow for nuanced decisions for each residential community.”

- 4.9.38. The EIAR for the Proposed Scheme includes provisions where appropriate for monitoring of the potential impacts of the works during construction.
- 4.9.39. Operational stage monitoring will be provided as part of the continuous management of the urban transport system across the Dublin area. There are existing arrangements and procedures that provide information about the operation of the transport system through both the National Transport Authority and the local authorities with information provided publicly on a regular basis. Briefings are provided for elected representatives at local and national level, which is the appropriate channel for communications with local communities. No further specific arrangements will be necessary in relation to BusConnects.

Displaced traffic will increase air pollution.

- 4.9.40. The NTA submits that the EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 7 Air Quality assessed the likely impacts of the Proposed Scheme in relation to the expected changes to traffic distribution across the urban area along and adjoining the Proposed Scheme. This assessment included consideration of the displacement of traffic onto other roads as is described in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport. The assessment included consideration of Rathgar Avenue where the peak traffic flow will increase by approximately 200 vehicles per hour (Tables 6-50 and 6-53). Section 7.6.2 in Chapter 7 in Volume 2 of the EIAR addresses the residual air quality impacts that are predicted as a result of the operation of the Proposed Scheme;

“The air dispersion modelling assessment has found that the majority of all modelled receptors are predicted to experience negligible impacts due to the Proposed Scheme,

and beneficial impacts are also estimated along the length of the Proposed Scheme. There are no substantial or moderate adverse effects expected as a result of the Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme. In 2028, all receptors will have ambient air quality in compliance with the ambient air quality limit values for the DS scenario. In 2043, all receptors are expected to have ambient air quality in compliance with the ambient air quality standards for the DM and the DS scenarios. Overall, it is considered that the residual effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme's operation will be Neutral and Long-Term."

Noise and Vibration impacts assessment.

- 4.9.41. EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 9 Noise & Vibration assessed the likely impacts of the Proposed Scheme in relation to the expected changes to traffic distribution across the urban area along and adjoining the Proposed Scheme. The NTA submit that this assessment included consideration of the displacement of traffic into other roads as is described in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport. The assessment included consideration of Stannaway Road Avenue where the peak traffic flow will increase by approximately 260 vehicles per hour (Tables 6-50 and 6-53). It is submitted that this increase in traffic is insufficient to give rise to a perceptible impact for noise.
- 4.9.42. Section 9.6.2 in Chapter 9 in Volume 2 of the EIAR addresses the residual noise and vibration impacts that are predicted as a result of the operation of the Proposed Scheme. There are no significant residual Operational Phase noise or vibration impacts predicted associated with the Proposed Scheme.
- 4.9.43. It states in Section 9.6.2 that:
- "...During the Design Year (2043), increased traffic noise levels will occur along a small number of roads adjacent to the Proposed Scheme as a result of traffic re-

distribution during daytime periods. During the long-term phase, noise impacts are calculated as Positive, Moderate and Long-Term impact to Negative, Not Significant to Slight and Long-Term impact along the surrounding road network off the Proposed Scheme....”

4.9.44. As mentioned above, traffic related cumulative impacts are addressed in the Section 21.3.2.1.2 in Chapter 21 of Volume 2 of the EIAR.

4.9.45. Section 9.4.4.1.2.1 of Chapter 9 (Noise & Vibration) notes that traffic noise levels along the surrounding road network, will be lower than those assumed for the impact assessment due to lower noise emissions from the future fleet of electric vehicles along urban and suburban roads with lower speeds, particularly those along residential streets and roads. In reality, the impacts determined and presented for both years will be further reduced when the lower noise emissions associated with electric fleet along low speed roads are factored in.

#### Construction compound K2 at Our Lady’s Hospice

4.9.46. The NTA submit that the proposed construction compound K2 will be located on the un-used grass lawn area along the southern side of the access road into the hospice as described in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.7. The compound will not impede access to the hospice which will continue along the existing access road beside the proposed compound. In addition, it is noted that access will be maintained for emergency vehicles along the Proposed Scheme, throughout the Construction Phase.

4.9.47. A CEMP has been prepared for the Proposed Scheme and is included as Appendix A5.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR. The CEMP will be updated by the NTA prior to finalising the Construction Contract documents for tender, so as to include any additional measures required pursuant to conditions attached to An Bord Pleanála’s decision. It will be a condition of the Employer’s Requirements that the successful

appointed contractor, immediately following appointment, must detail in the CEMP the manner in which it is intended to effectively implement all the applicable mitigation measures.

Impacts for Biodiversity and Wildlife along River Poddle at Stone Boat.

4.9.48. The NTA submit that Section 12.4.4 of the EIAR describes the potential biodiversity impacts that could occur as a result of the operation of the Proposed Scheme. The proposed boardwalk at the Stone Boat is specifically referenced:

- Section 12.4.4.4.3 of the EIAR addresses the potential impacts on otters. It concludes under a variety of topics that the Proposed Scheme (and specifically the boardwalk) will not result in significant impacts on otters at any geographic scale.
- Section 12.4.4.5 addresses the potential impacts on birds. Localised disturbance effects on breeding birds will most likely be of greater impact at the River Poddle, than the remainder of the Proposed Scheme. The provision of the Stone Boat Boardwalk along the River Poddle has the potential to result in increased human presence in this area. It is considered that there may be temporary non-significant effects on breeding riparian birds at a local scale, until such a time that they have established new nesting sites.
- Section 12.5 outlines the detailed mitigation measures that will be implemented along the Proposed Scheme to minimise impacts. A Surface Water Management Plan (see Section 12.5.1.2.2) has been prepared and will be implemented by the contractor. Additional measures are proposed for the Construction of the Stone Boat boardwalk.

- Section 12.6 sets out the residual impacts as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. Tables 12.15 and 12.16 summarise the construction and operational phase significant residual impacts respectively. No significant residual biodiversity impacts are predicted as a result of the Proposed Scheme (including for the Stone Boat).

Justification and Need for the Scheme, General Transport Strategy, Alternatives, Cumulative Impacts, Traffic Modelling, Bus Services and CBC Scheme Benefits, Bus Gate Impacts and Enforcement, Displacement of Traffic to Surrounding Routes, in particular TRN / Harolds Cross Road / Wellington Lane, Templeogue, Access restrictions to Mount Jerome Cemetery due to Bus Gates and Traffic Restrictions

4.9.49. The NTA have responded in detail to all if these issues. I note the following responses, but highlight it is not an all-inclusive summary.

- The consideration of the project and other strategic alternatives have been considered through the preparation of both the GDA Transport Strategy 2016 – 2035 and the new GDA Transport Strategy 2022 – 2042. This is presented Chapter 3 Consideration of Reasonable Alternatives of Volume 2 of the EIAR.
- A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was undertaken on the prior GDA Transport Strategy (NTA 2016)
- Given the importance of bus transport as the main public transport mode for the overall region, the delivery of an efficient and reliable bus system formed an important element of the prior GDA Transport Strategy, integrated appropriately with the other transport modes. As Dublin is a low-density city with a large geographic footprint, there are few areas with the size and concentration of

population necessary to support rail based public transport, and the bus system remains essential to serve the needs of much of the region.

- Consideration has been given to both a light rail or metro option for the corridor and details are presented in Chapter 3 Consideration of Reasonable Alternatives of Volume 2 of the EIAR.
- The full programme for BusConnects Dublin includes a range of interlinked and complementary proposals.
- In the absence of the Proposed Scheme, bus services will operate in a more congested environment, leading to higher journey times for bus and lower reliability which will lead to reduced levels of public transport use, making the bus system far less attractive and less resilient to higher levels of growth. The absence of walking and cycling measures that the Proposed Scheme provides will significantly limit the potential to grow those modes into the future.
- Park & Ride facilities are not proposed for locations along the Bus Network routes, as this network will be within walking distance of most people's homes.
- Park & Ride facilities will be provided to serve long distance commuters along national roads (N11 & N7) at suitable locations.
- The provision of bus gates in the Proposed Scheme will lead to longer car journeys for some trips, which will be proportionately higher for shorter trips, and less so for longer trips. These impacts for a small number of trips will arise so as to enable faster, more reliable, more sustainable trips by other modes, and safer journeys for cyclists in particular.
- There will be a reduction in the volume of car traffic along this corridor, which it is submitted will reduce by 50% in 2028 AM Peak Hour.

- There will be significant benefits for the Climate Action Plan commitments due a major decrease in traffic generally, even if a small proportion of drivers will have increased fuel consumption due to longer journeys on alternative routes caused by bus gate restrictions on the more direct route.
- The provision of bus services is separate from the Proposed Scheme and is planned to provide sufficient capacity to meet the projected demand as forecast. Once the public transport infrastructure is improved.
- The estimated journey time savings from a minimum of 1.5 minutes minimum up to 5.5 minutes maximum, is shown in Table 6-40 of EIAR Chapter 6. However, the primary benefit of the Proposed Scheme will be to support a more reliable bus service with more consistent journey times by reducing the range in bus journey time from 14 minutes to about 4 minutes.
- The estimated modal shift of 80% to bus will derive from passengers having greater confidence in the bus service, rather than simply because of a shorter journey time.
- Changes to the bus route network is separate to the Proposed Scheme and was subject to a separate public consultation process.
- There is no need for a separate local school bus service in an urban area with an extensive network of general bus services.
- All public transport vehicles in Dublin are accessible to people with mobility impairment. In the Proposed Scheme, and on the other 11 Core Bus Corridor Schemes, the bus stops will be improved to a consistent standard to ensure that they are suitable for easy boarding and alighting from buses for people with mobility impairment.

- Since the disruption of COVID-19 there has been some shift of work patterns towards a greater share of remote working, which has reduced individual transport demand to a modest degree. However, in the meantime the number of people employed has grown substantially and overall transport demand has rebounded and grown to exceed the pre-COVID levels.
- It is envisaged that the population will grow by 11% up to 2028 and 25% by 2043 (above 2016 census data levels). Similarly, employment is due to grow by 22% by 2028 and 49% by 2043". The modelling has accounted for the population and employment growth envisaged for the region. The need for substantial improvements to the public transport and cycling infrastructure is clear.
- The NTA welcomes the submission with support for the proposed Bus Gates by residents on Kimmage Road Lower which they expect to greatly reduce traffic through their residential area.
- The Proposed Scheme will cause a general reduction and redistribution of traffic in a wide area along and to the south of the route corridor. A significant reduction in traffic along Fortfield Road because of the bus gates north of the Kimmage Cross Road junction is predicted. Buses will not be delayed on Fortfield Road, Kimmage Road West and Terenure Road West beyond the southern end of the CBC, and in fact will benefit from the upstream effects of the bus gate in reduced traffic flow.
- There will be a general rationalisation and optimisation of bus stops to support a faster and more efficient bus service.
- An example of the proposed rationalisation is on the 240m length of Kimmage Road Lower between Kimmage Crossroads and Ravensdale Park where there are two inbound bus stops (No.2438 and No.2439) with spacing of only 150m.



These will be replaced with a single bus stop between the two existing locations, which will be paired with the outbound bus stop on the other side of the road and linked by a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing just to the north of the junction of Hazelbrook Road. The provision of a single bus stop will contribute to the overall improvement of the bus services by reducing the need for buses to stop twice on this short section of street. The consolidated bus stop is also optimised in terms of walking distance from the surrounding area, and this will be assisted by the provision of a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing to replace the existing uncontrolled crossing on a wide section of Kimmage Road Lower.

- The Proposed Scheme is unusual in that there will be 3 bus gates along Kimmage Road Lower that will operate in combination with each other. The principal Bus Gate No.2 just south of Harold's Cross Park will provide the main control of general traffic to provide bus priority and low-flow traffic conditions for cyclists to share the road with a small amount of local traffic over a 2km length of the route. This bus gate will operate on a full-time basis, along with Bus Gate No.3 in the southbound direction. In this context, and to enable appropriate access for local traffic it is proposed that Bus Gate No.1 will operate during peak hours only. This the NTA submits will provide a balance between the desirable bus priority and the degree of traffic displacement onto other local roads. Similarly, Bus Gate No.3 will operate during peak hours only in the northbound direction so as to accommodate funeral traffic leaving from Mount Jerome Cemetery and to spread that traffic more evenly on the streets surrounding Harold's Cross Park.
- Because of the proposed bus gates and their extensive operational hours the traffic environment along Kimmage Road Lower will be transformed into a "Low-Flow & Slow" context where cyclists can safely and comfortably share the road

with a low volume of local access traffic, in accordance with the requirements of the Cycle Design Manual. In this context it is not necessary to provide segregated cycling facilities. In the Proposed Scheme the existing part-time cycle lanes that operate in the peak periods inbound in the morning and outbound in the evening will be mostly retained. However, if the bus gates were only to operate at peak periods on weekdays, then the traffic conditions for cyclists would not suit shared use of the road and segregated cycle tracks would be necessary, which would require widening into gardens along almost the full 2km length of Kimmage Road Lower.

- In relation to the hours of operation for the southern bus gate in the evenings and the suggestion to open it to traffic at 7pm instead of 8pm, experience with the operation of part-time bus lanes in Dublin has shown that some drivers will delay their homeward trip in the evening to coincide with the end of restrictions at 7pm. Thus the evening peak traffic can extend beyond 7pm along such routes. Such an arrangement on Kimmage Road Lower could lead to an increase in traffic flows later into the evening, which would have a detrimental effect on cyclists using the route without the benefit of segregated cycle tracks.
- Emergency Vehicles are permitted to pass through bus gates and will not be restricted on such routes.
- Emergency vehicle drivers and despatchers will know of all road closures and can plan their journeys to use appropriate alternative routes to minimise delay.
- The NTA acknowledges the comments raised in relation to camera enforcement. Whilst enforcement for the lawful use of bus lanes is currently a matter for An Garda Síochána, the NTA is separately exploring proposals and methods for bus lane enforcement as set out under Measure INT24 – Enforcement of Road Traffic Laws of the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022-2042.

Concern of noise and pollution, anti-climate change.

- 4.9.50. The NTA's response sets out that the impact of noise and vibration have been assessed and are reported in Chapter 9 Noise and Vibration of Volume 2 of the EIAR. The traffic noise impacts associated with the Proposed Scheme have fully considered any physical changes along the Proposed Scheme.
- 4.9.51. Section 9.6.2 of the EIAR addresses the residual noise and vibration impacts that are predicted as a result of the operation of the Proposed Scheme. There are no significant residual Operational Phase noise or vibration impacts predicted. It states in Section 9.6.2 that:
- “...During the Design Year (2043), increased traffic noise levels will occur along a small number of roads adjacent to the Proposed Scheme as a result of traffic re-distribution during daytime periods. During the long-term phase, noise impacts are calculated as Positive, Moderate and LongTerm impact to Negative, Not Significant to Slight and Long-Term impact along the surrounding road network off the Proposed Scheme....”
- 4.9.52. The NTA highlights, Chapter 7 Air Quality in Volume 2 of the EIAR, assessed the likely impacts of the Proposed Scheme in relation to the expected changes to traffic distribution across the urban area along and adjoining the Proposed Scheme. The air dispersion modelling assessment has found that the majority of all modelled receptors are predicted to experience negligible impacts due to the Proposed Scheme, and beneficial impacts are also estimated along the length of the Proposed Scheme. There are no substantial or moderate adverse effects expected as a result of the Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme. In 2028, all receptors will have ambient air quality in compliance with the ambient air quality limit values for the DS

scenario. In 2043, all receptors are expected to have ambient air quality in compliance with the ambient air quality standards for the DM and the DS scenarios.

- 4.9.53. Overall, it is considered that the residual effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme's operation will be Neutral and Long-Term.

No consideration of what happens buses in the City Centre

- 4.9.54. The Proposed Scheme forms part of the wider Core Bus network which aligns with the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy to form an integral part of the improved public transport infrastructure measures for the Dublin Metropolitan area.
- 4.9.55. The Core Bus Network Report focused on the overall existing bus service network and identified locations where the bus network is operating sub-optimally. The network is dominated by a radial network to / from Dublin City Centre, supplemented by low frequency orbital and local bus routes serving larger destinations outside of the City Centre core.
- 4.9.56. The GDA Transport Strategy 2016 – 2035 concluded that this high-quality Core Bus Network would form an integral part of the improved public transport infrastructure measures for the Dublin Metropolitan Area. The final resulting Core Bus Network presented in the GDA Transport Strategy represents the most important bus routes within the Dublin Metropolitan Area, generally characterised by high passenger volumes, frequent services and significant trip attractors along the routes.
- 4.9.57. In meeting its objectives, the Proposed Scheme will deliver strong positive impacts in terms of promoting active travel and sustainable transport. This is demonstrated in the traffic modelling undertaken, the results of which are presented in Chapter 6 of the EIAR. It is noted that this modelling includes the movement of buses to and through the city and centre, and as such the benefits include consideration of buses moving through the city centre.

#### Impact on property values

- 4.9.58. The NTA submit that evidence shows that investing in public realm creates nicer places that are more desirable for people and business to locate in, thereby increasing the value of properties in the area. Also, that residents along the corridors will see a measurable increase in their quality of life, with evidence showing that residents are willing to pay more for an improved public realm.
- 4.9.59. It is submitted that a combination of improved connectivity as a result of the dedicated public transport infrastructure being rolled out by the Proposed Scheme as well as public realm improvements, will not have a negative impact on values of residential properties

#### 4.10. Planning History

4.11. There are a significant number of planning applications along the route which include large residential, domestic residential such as alterations to existing houses, commercial development and telecommunication infrastructure etc, a full list is provided by the applicant within Appendix 2 of the Planning Report document submitted with the application. Of relevance to this scheme and including a number referred to by Dublin City Council within their submission to the application is the following:

**ABP Ref. 311691/ Reg. Ref 2769/21 - 348 Harold's Cross Road, Dublin 6W, formerly known as 'Kenilworth Motors, Permission Granted on 01/07/2022 for** Demolition of buildings and certain boundary walls, construction of building comprising 52 apartments, communal residential amenities, alterations to the layout of Laundry Lane and associated site works.

**Reg. Ref. 2825/17 / PL29S.30031 (SHD) Former Saint Clares Convent and nos. 115-119 Harolds Cross Road, Dublin 6. Permission Granted on 12/04/2018 for** an increase of no. of apartment units from 156 to 172 via internal reconfiguration with balcony relocation, extra parking, bicycle spaces & all associated site works. The application lodged with the planning authority indicates proposals for three replacement apartment blocks for the three previously permitted blocks (E, F and G) (P.A. Reg. Ref. 2085/15 /PL 29S 245164 refers.) These three permitted blocks within the site subject of the application are four storey apartment blocks located in the north east, east and southern areas the existing buildings being in clustered in the west and north west within the site.

**ABP Ref. 305695-19 / Reg. Ref. 3026/19 Classic Cinema Site, at Harolds Cross Road, Dublin 6W. Permission Granted on 02/03/2020** for Demolition of buildings on site, construction of a mixed-use development of retail, offices and 91 dwelling units.

**Reg. Ref. 4735/18 126-128 Harold's Cross Road, Dublin 6W Planning**

**Permission granted on 20 August 2019** for the demolition of existing buildings and structures on site, with the exception of the front facade of no. 126 Harold's Cross Road; Construction of an infill residential development of 34 no. apartments with associated balconies/terraces comprising 18 no. 2 bedroom units, 11 no. 1 bedroom units and 5 no. studio units in 2 no. blocks (Block 1 & Block 2). Basement level to accommodate 30 no. car parking spaces, bicycle parking, refuse store and plant; Landscaped courtyard at ground floor podium level; Vehicular access from Harold's Cross Road, via 2 no. mechanised car lifts located in Block 2; All ancillary site development works, boundary treatment works and services.

**Reg. Ref. 4729/18: Site at no. 280-288 Harold's Cross Road. Permission granted on the 30.08.2019 for demolition of all buildings on site** including the 3 storey public house and single storey retail units; Construction of a 3-6 storey over basement mixed use building to accommodate a ground floor retail unit (c. 339m<sup>2</sup>) fronting Harold's Cross Road and 74 no. apartments at ground to fifth floors with associated balconies, comprising 5 no. studios, 29 no. 1-bed, 31 no. 2-bed and 9 no. 3-bed units; Ramped vehicular access from Harold's Cross Road; Basement level accommodating 35 no. car parking space, bicycle parking, refuse stores and plant rooms; Landscaping, boundary treatments, retail signage, bicycle parking and all associated works.

**Reg. Ref. 3420/21 126-128 Harold's Cross Road, Dublin 6W Planning**

**Permission granted on 09/02/2023** for modifications to the previously approved permission DCC Reg Ref. 4735/18 - ABP 304552-19. Modifications are to include the addition of 6 no extra units achieved by way of an additional floor to the previously granted block 1, bringing the proposed height of the building from 5 storey to 6 storey and increasing the total units in the proposed development from 34 no. units (4 no. studio, 14 no. one bed, 13 no. two bed) up to 40 no. apartment units (4 no. studio, 17 one bed, 16 no. two bed). No modifications to block 2 are proposed from the scheme outlined in DCC Reg. Ref. 4735/18 - ABP-304552-19. No modifications to the no. of bicycle parking spaces (70 no.) and car parking spaces (30 no.) or basement layout are proposed. All associated signage, site works, drainage, street lighting and landscaping are as per the previously granted scheme.

**Reg. Ref. 2851/21 / ABP-311174-21 Former Harold's Cross Greyhound Stadium, Harold's Cross, Dublin 6. Planning Permission Granted on**

**30/03/2022 for** Demolition of existing stand, pavilion building, other outbuildings and entrance gates from Harold's Cross Road. New school campus consisting of

- 1 no. 2 storey, 16 classroom primary school and 2 no. classroom Special Education Needs Unit, general purpose hall and ancillary facilities. The building is to have a stated gross floor area of 3308 sq. m
- 1 no. part 4 storey 1000 pupil post primary school with 4 no. classroom Special Education Needs Unit. The building is to have a stated gross floor area of c.11,576 sq.m including a P.E. Hall, general purpose hall and ancillary facilities.
- 1 no. single storey bin storage.



- Ancillary works and facilities.

**Reg. Ref. 2712/21 / ABP 310947-21 153-155, Harold's Cross Road, Dublin 6W (formerly known as Michael Grant Motors) Permission Granted on the 23/05/2022** for demolition of former car showroom and garage and construction of 38 no. build to rent apartments.

**Reg. Ref. 3619/20 Site at 39, 40, 41, 42 & 42A, Clanbrassil Street Upper, Dublin 8 Planning permission granted** for 1.) The demolition of existing buildings, structures and hardstanding areas on site except for the existing front part of the 2-storey take-away restaurant building (vacant) at 39 Clanbrassil Street Upper; 2.) The construction of a mixed-use development of 28 no. apartments with associated balconies/terraces comprising 17 no. 1 bedroom units & 11 no. 2 bedroom units and 2 no. commercial units located in 2 no. blocks (Block 1 & Block 2); Landscaped courtyard at ground floor level and roof terrace above third floor level in Block 2; Construction of new surface finishes and hard and soft landscaping to increased width Garden Terrace pedestrian laneway to the north; All ancillary site development works, plant areas, refuse storage areas, bicycle storage areas, boundary treatment works and services.

**Reg. Ref. 4249/22 Site at 39 Clanbrassil Street Upper, Dublin 8 Planning permission granted** for change of use for the front part of the existing 2 storey take-away restaurant building (vacant). The application seeks modifications to Block 1 of the previously granted permission DCC Reg. Ref. 3619/20 {ABP-309667-21). Block 1 comprised of a part 2 storey/ part 2 storey plus pitched roof building at 39 Clanbrassil Street Upper accommodating 1 No. take-away restaurant unit at ground & 1st floor level {including existing structure fronting onto Clanbrassil Street Upper) and 4 No. apartments (4 No. 2 Bedroom 2 storey own-door duplex apartment units) extending along Orr's Terrace. The modifications seek change of use of previously granted take-away restaurant use to residential use to provide 1 No. Duplex Studio

over ground and first floor. The proposed works include removal of existing signage and provision of a new entrance door to the front. All with associated bin store, bicycle store, and associated site works.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. European

#### 5.2. Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy 2020 (EU Commission 2020)

The Smart and Mobility Strategy is part of the EU Green Deal and aims to reduce transport emissions by 90% until 2050. The Commission intends to adopt a comprehensive strategy to meet this target and ensure that the EU transport sector is fit for a clean, digital and modern economy. Objectives include:

- increasing the uptake of zero-emission vehicles
- making sustainable alternative solutions available to the public & businesses
- supporting digitalisation & automation
- improving connectivity & access.

#### 5.3. European Green Deal (EDG) 2019

The European Commission has adopted a set of proposals such as making transport sustainable for all, to make the EU's climate, energy, transport and taxation **policies fit for reducing net greenhouse gas emissions by at least 55% by 2030**, compared to 1990 levels.

#### 5.4. Towards a fair and sustainable Europe 2050: Social and Economic choices in sustainability transitions, 2023.

This foresight study looks at sustainability from a holistic perspective but emphasises the changes that European economic and social systems should make to address sustainability transitions. The EU has committed to sustainability and sustainable development, covering the three dimensions (environmental, social and economic) of sustainability. Transport is identified as an area of opportunity to increase the speed of a cultural shift towards sustainability. The provision of well planned, affordable or free public transport system and bicycle lanes are encouraged.

## **5.5. National**

### **5.6. National Sustainable Mobility Policy, 2022**

The purpose of this document is to set out a strategic framework to 2030 for active travel and public transport to support Ireland's overall requirement to achieve a 51% reduction in carbon emissions by the end of this decade.

A key objective of the document is to expand the bus capacity and services through the BusConnects Programmes in the five cities of Cork, Dublin, Galway, Limerick and Waterford; improved town bus services; and the Connecting Ireland programme in rural areas.

### **5.7. National Sustainable Mobility Policy Action Plan 2022-2025**

BusConnects is identified as a key project to be delivered within 2025.

### **5.8. Permeability in Existing Urban Areas Best Practice Guide 2015**

Among the priorities of the National Transport Authority (NTA) are to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport and to ensure that transport considerations are fully addressed as part of land use planning. This guidance demonstrates how best to facilitate demand for walking and cycling in existing built-up areas.

### **5.9. Department of Transport National Sustainable Mobility Policy on 7th April 2022.**

The plan, prepared by the Department of Transport, includes actions to improve and expand sustainable mobility options across the country by providing safe, green, accessible and efficient alternatives to car journeys.

- United Nations 2030 Agenda

### **5.10. Smarter Travel – A Sustainable Transport Future: A New Transport Policy for Ireland 2009 – 2020**

This is a government document that was prepared in the context of unsustainable transport and travel trends in Ireland. The overall vision set out in this policy document is to achieve a sustainable transport system in Ireland by 2020.

To achieve this the government set out 5 key goals

- (i) to reduce overall travel demand,
- (ii) to maximise the efficiency of the transport network,
- (iii) to reduce reliance on fossil fuels,
- (iv) to reduce transport emissions and
- (v) to improve accessibility to transport.

To achieve these goals and to ensure that we have sustainable travel and transport by 2020, the Government sets targets, which include the following:

- 500,000 more people will take alternative means to commute to work to the extent that the total share of car commuting will drop from 65% to 45%

- Alternatives such as walking, cycling and public transport will be supported and provided to the extent that these will rise to 55% of total commuter journeys to work.

#### **5.11. National Planning Framework Project Ireland 2040**

The National Policy Position establishes the fundamental national objective of achieving transition to a competitive, low carbon, climate resilient and environmentally sustainable economy by 2050,

Managing the challenges of future growth is critical to regional development. A more balanced and sustainable pattern of development, with a greater focus on addressing employment creation, local infrastructure needs and addressing the legacy of rapid growth, must be prioritised. This means that housing development should be primarily based on employment growth, accessibility by sustainable transport modes and quality of life, rather than unsustainable commuting patterns.

##### National Strategic Outcome 4

- NSO 4 - Dublin and other cities and major urban areas are too heavily dependent on road and private, mainly car based, transport with the result that our roads are becoming more and more congested. The National Development Plan makes provision for investment in public transport and sustainable mobility solutions to progressively put in place a more sustainable alternative. For example, major electric rail public transport infrastructure identified in the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area to 2035, such as the Metro Link and DART Expansion projects as well as the BusConnects investment programme, will keep our capital and other key urban areas competitive.
- Deliver the key public transport objectives of the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035 by investing in projects such as New Metro

Link, DART Expansion Programme, BusConnects in Dublin and key bus-based projects in the other cities and towns.

## **5.12. National Development Plan 2021-2030**

The NDP Review contains a range of investments and measures which will be implemented over the coming years to facilitate the transition to sustainable mobility. These measures include significant expansions to public transport options, including capacity enhancements on current assets and the creation of new public transport links through programmes such as Metrolink.

The NDP recognises Busconnects as one of the Major Regional Investments for the Eastern and Midland Region and this scheme is identified as a Strategic Investment Priority within all five cities.

Over the next 10 years approximately €360 million per annum will be invested in walking and cycling infrastructure in cities, towns and villages across the country.

Transformed active travel and bus infrastructure and services in all five of Ireland's major cities is fundamental to achieving the overarching target of 500,000 additional active travel and public transport journeys by 2030. BusConnects will overhaul the current bus system in all five cities by implementing a network of 'next generation' bus corridors including segregated cycling facilities on the busiest routes to make journeys faster, predictable and reliable.

Over the lifetime of this NDP, there will be significant progress made on delivering BusConnects with the construction of Core Bus Corridors expected to be substantially complete in all five cities by 2030.

### **5.13. National Investment Framework for Transport in Ireland, 2021**

One of the key challenges identified within this document relates to transport and the ability to maintain existing transport infrastructure whilst ensuring resilience of the most strategically important parts of the network. Population projections are expected to increase into the future and a consistent issue identified within the five cities of Ireland is congestion. Given space constraints, urban congestion will primarily have to be addressed by encouraging modal shift to sustainable modes.

Within the cities, frequent and reliable public transport of sufficient capacity and high-quality active travel infrastructure can incentivise people to travel using sustainable modes rather than by car.

Bus Connects is identified as a project which will alleviate congestion and inefficiencies in the bus service. The revised NDP 2021- 2030 sets out details of a new National Active Travel Programme with funding of €360 million annually for the period from 2021 to 2025. A new National Cycling Strategy is to be developed by the end of 2022, and will map existing cycling infrastructure in both urban and rural areas to inform future planning and project delivery decisions in relation to active travel.

### **5.14. Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019**

This Manual provides guidance on how to approach the design of urban streets in a more balanced way. To encourage more sustainable travel patterns and safer streets, the Manual states that designers must place the pedestrian at the top of the user hierarchy, followed by cyclists and public transport, with the private car at the bottom of the hierarchy. The following key design principles are set out to guide a more place-based/ integrated approach to road and street design.

- To support the creation of integrated street networks which primate higher levels of permeability and legibility for all users, and in particular more sustainable forms of transport.
- The promotion of multi functional, placed based streets that balance the needs of all users within a self regulating environment.
- The quality of the street is measured by the quality of the pedestrian environment.
- Greater communication and communication and cooperation between design professionals through the promotion of a plan-led multidisciplinary approach to design.

The manual recommends that bus services should be directed along arterial and link streets and that selective bus detection technology should be considered that prioritises buses. It is noted that under used or unnecessary lanes can serve only to increase the width of carriageways (encouraging greater speeds) and can consume space that could otherwise be dedicated to placemaking /traffic calming measures.

#### **5.15. Climate Action Plan 2024**

- The Climate Action Plan (CAP24) sets out a roadmap to halve emissions by 2030 and reach net zero by 2050. CAP24 is the third annual update to Ireland's Climate Action Plan 2019 and the second to be prepared under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021. These national targets align with Ireland's obligations under EU and international treaties, most notably the Paris Agreement (2015) and the European Green Deal (2020)
- Citizen engagement and a strengthened social contract between the Government and the Irish people will be required around climate action. Some



sectors and communities will be impacted more than others. A just transition is embedded in CAP24 to equip people with the skills to benefit from change and to acknowledge that costs need to be shared. Large investment will be necessary through public and private sectors to meet CAP24 targets and objectives.

- The electricity sector will help to decarbonise the transport, heating and industry sectors and will face a huge challenge to meet requirements under its own sectoral emissions ceiling. CAP24 reframes the previous pathway outlined in CAP21 under the Avoid-Shift-Improve Framework to achieve a net zero decarbonisation pathway for transport. This is a hierarchical framework which prioritises actions to reduce or **avoid** the need to travel; **shift** to more environmentally friendly modes; and **improve** the energy efficiency of vehicle technology.
- Road space reallocation is a measure outlined under both 'avoid' and 'shift' to promote active travel and modal shift to public transport. It is recognised that road space reallocation can redirect valuable space from on-street car-parking and public urban roadways to public transport and active travel infrastructure (such as efficient bus lanes, and more spacious footpaths and segregated cycle-lanes), whilst also leading to significant and wide-scale improvements in our urban environments. A National Demand Management Strategy is being developed with the aim of reducing travel demand and improving sustainable mobility alternatives.
- The major public transport infrastructure programme set out in the NDP sets out significant investment in new public transport infrastructure is required to deliver on our carbon emissions reduction targets, and to provide people with the sustainable alternatives to private car usage. Major public transport projects

and programmes that are being progressed under the National Development Plan include MetroLink, DART+, BusConnects programmes in all five cities and commuter rail programmes in Cork and Limerick, which have been progressing through major delivery milestones.

- With respect to BusConnects Dublin, the programme as well as the procurement strategy for Next Generation Ticketing has significantly advanced, with five phases of the Network Redesign now live, with significant uplift in passenger numbers observed on these routes. Twelve planning applications have been lodged with An Bord Pleanála since April 2022 in respect of the Core Bus Corridor infrastructure to be delivered in the course of subsequent phases.
- Meeting our 2030 transport abatement targets will require transformational change and accelerated action across the transport sector. Key targets to remain within the sectoral emissions ceiling include a 20% reduction in total vehicle kilometres travelled relative to business-as-usual, a 50% reduction in fossil fuel usage, a significant behavioural shift from private car usage to increase the total share of journeys undertaken by walking, cycling or public transport, and continued electrification of our vehicle fleets. While fleet electrification and the use of renewable transport fuels will continue to provide the greatest share of emissions abatement in the medium term, we will continue to expand our walking, cycling and public transport networks in order to reorient our transport systems to a more sustainable basis and to facilitate widespread behavioural change to a healthier, safer, and more people-focused vision for transport. We will continue to pursue policy measures that promote greater efficiency in our transport system, allied with significant investment in sustainable alternatives, incentives and regulatory measures to promote the accelerated take-up of low carbon technologies.

#### **5.16. Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2015 (as amended)**

The Act commits Ireland to the objective of becoming a carbon-neutral economy by 2050, reducing emissions by 51% by the end of the decade.

Section 15(1) of the 2015 Act (as substituted by section 17 of the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021 (the “2021 Act”)) provides that:

*“A relevant body shall, in so far as practicable, perform its functions in a manner consistent with—*

- (a) the most recent approved climate action plan,*
- (b) the most recent approved national long term climate action strategy,*
- (c) the most recent approved national adaptation framework and approved sectoral adaptation plans,*
- (d) the furtherance of the national climate objective, and*
- (e) the objective of mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to the effects of climate change in the State.”*

#### **5.17. Regional**

#### **5.18. Regional Spatial Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midlands Region**

- Chapter 5 Dublin Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP)
  - The MASP is an integrated land use and transportation strategy for the Dublin Metropolitan Area that sets out a vision for the future growth of the metropolitan area and key growth enablers.
  - Section 5.3 Guiding Principles for the growth of the Dublin Metropolitan Area - Integrated Transport and Land use which seeks to focus growth

along existing and proposed high quality public transport corridors and nodes on the expanding public transport network and to support the delivery and integration of '**BusConnects**', DART expansion and LUAS extension programmes, and Metro Link, while maintaining the capacity and safety of strategic transport networks.

- MASP Sustainable Transport RPO 5.2: Support the delivery of key sustainable transport projects including Metrolink, DART and LUAS expansion programmes, BusConnects and the Greater Dublin Metropolitan Cycle Network and ensure that future development maximises the efficiency and protects the strategic capacity of the metropolitan area transport network, existing and planned.
- RPO 5.3: Future development in the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall be planned and designed in a manner that facilitates sustainable travel patterns, with a particular focus on increasing the share of active modes (walking and cycling) and public transport use and creating a safe attractive street environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Section 5.6 Integrated Land use and Transportation-
  - Key transport infrastructure investments in the metropolitan area as set out in national policy include:
  - Within the Dublin Metropolitan Area, investment in bus based public transport will be delivered through BusConnects, which aims to overhaul the current bus system in the Dublin metropolitan area, including the introduction of Bus Rapid Transit.
- Chapter 8 Connectivity
  - Section 8.4 Transport Investment Priorities:

- Within the Dublin Metropolitan Area, investment in bus infrastructure and services will be delivered through BusConnects.
- Section 8.5 International Connectivity:
  - RPO 8.18: Improved access to Dublin Airport is supported, including Metrolink and improved bus services as part of BusConnects, connections from the road network from the west and north. Improve cycle access to Dublin Airport and surrounding employment locations. Support appropriate levels of car parking and car hire parking.

## **5.19. Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042**

- 5.19.1. The 2022-2042 Transport Strategy sets out a framework for investment in transport infrastructure and services in the Greater Dublin Area (GDA) up to 2042. The Transport Strategy recognises a wide range of challenges for transport underpinned by climate change; the Covid 19 pandemic; servicing the legacy development patterns; revitalising city and town centres; transforming the urban environment; ensuring universal access; serving rural development; improving health and equality; fostering economic development; and delivering transport schemes.
- 5.19.2. The overall aim of the Transport Strategy is “to provide a sustainable, accessible and effective transport system for the Greater Dublin Area which meets the region’s climate change requirements, serves the needs of urban and rural communities, and supports the regional economy.”
- 5.19.3. Chapters 10, 11 and 12 of the Transport Strategy address walking, accessibility, and the public realm; cycling and personal mobility vehicles; and public transport

respectively, and these sections relate both directly and indirectly to the proposed BusConnects programme.

5.19.4. Chapter 12 sets out the strategy for an overall public transport system for the region, central to which is the delivery of a comprehensive bus network, based on enhanced level of service and much greater on-street priority. Section 12.2.2 of the Transport Strategy notes that BusConnects Dublin comprises a range of elements including approximately 230km of radial bus priority and 200km of cycle routes, a new bus service network, new bus stops and shelters, low/zero emissions bus fleet, new park and ride interchanges, and a revised fare structure. The Proposed Scheme is one of 12 radial schemes being brought forward under this programme to facilitate faster and more reliable bus journeys on the busiest bus corridors in the Dublin region. Key elements of the Cycle Network Plan will also be delivered along these corridors. The following measures in the Transport Strategy relate to the roll out of BusConnects:

- BUS1 – Core Bus Corridor Programme: Subject to receipt of statutory consents, it is the intention of the NTA to implement the 12 Core Bus Corridors as set out in the BusConnects Dublin programme.
- BUS2 – Additional Radial Core Bus Corridors: It is the intention of the NTA to evaluate the need for, and deliver, additional priority on radial corridors.
- BUS3 – Orbital and Local Bus Routes: It is the intention of the NTA to provide significant improvements to orbital and local bus services in the following ways:
  - Increase frequencies on the BusConnects orbital and local bus services; and

- Providing bus priority measures at locations on the routes where delays to services are identified.

5.19.5. A new Dublin area bus service network will be arranged on the basis on spines radiating from the city centre, orbitals around the city, other city bound routes, local routes, peak only services, and express routes. Periodic review will take place to implement appropriate additions or adjustments to the overall bus system.

5.19.6. With respect to walking, accessibility, and the public realm, it is recognised in the Transport Strategy that better urban design and placemaking will encourage more people to walk, cycle or use public transport. Specific measures are outlined to incorporate a high standard of urban design and placemaking into major public transport infrastructure schemes and walking and cycling projects, taking account of architectural heritage (PLAN14 and PLAN15 of the Transport Strategy refer). Furthermore, measure PLAN16 seeks the reallocation of road space to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport use and the placemaking functions of the urban street network. Other specific measures relating to walking, accessibility and public realm include Measure WALK2 – Improved Footpaths; Measure WALK4 – Improved Junctions; Measure WALK6 – Crossing Points; Measure WALK8 – Traffic-Free Streets and Pedestrianisation; and Measure WALK9 – regarding those with disabilities or mobility impairments.

5.19.7. In terms of cycling and personalised mobility vehicles, it is the intention of the NTA and the local authorities to deliver a safe, comprehensive, attractive, and legible cycle network in accordance with the updated Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network (Measure CYC1 of the Transport Strategy refers). It is noted that some of the cycle provision included in BusConnects schemes examines the appropriateness of emerging international approaches to design standards. As the number of cyclists grows, the requirement to ensure that cyclists can travel unimpeded along their entire

journey becomes critical and this needs to be reflected in how cycle infrastructure and other traffic is managed. This is reflected in the Transport Strategy through Measure CYC2 – Cycle Infrastructure Design; Measure CYC3 – Extended Hours of Operation of Cycle Infrastructure; and Measure CYC4 – Maintenance of Cycle Infrastructure.

- 5.19.8. Chapter 17 provides the outcomes and how the Strategy contributes to an enhanced natural and built environment (consolidated development, public realm and placemaking, reduced impacts of traffic, improved air quality and noise levels); how the Strategy leads to more connected communities and better quality of life (enhanced community interaction, high quality public transport coverage); how the Strategy contributes to a strong and sustainable economy; and how the Strategy fosters an inclusive transport system (equality, health and access to jobs).

## **5.20. Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan**

- 5.20.1. The updated Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan, 2022, is published alongside the Transport Strategy. Cycle facilities proposed under BusConnects will contribute towards the intention of the NTA and local authorities to deliver a safe, comprehensive, attractive and legible cycle network in accordance with the updated Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network.
- 5.20.2. The 2013 Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan included one primary cycle route along the Proposed Scheme (Cycle Route 9A (Harolds Cross Road from south of Kimmage Cross Roads (KCR) to the Grand Canal). In terms of the need to improve facilities for cyclists, as referenced in Section 2.2.1.4, as part of the GDACNP 2013, there are two primary radial cycle routes (radial cycle routes 9 and 9B) and one primary orbital cycle route (N10), as well as three secondary orbital cycle routes (including S01, S02, S03) along the route of the Proposed Scheme.



- 5.20.3. The updated 2022 GDA Cycle Network Plan shows the CBC as a primary radial cycle route from south of KCR along Harolds Cross Road to city centre and a secondary route along Kimmage Road Lower. A number of feeder routes intersect with the CBC at Leinster Road, Mount Drummond Avenue, Mount Argus Road, Aideen Avenue and Poddle Park.
- 5.20.4. The Proposed Scheme will help to deliver the Cycle Network through installation of cycle tracks and safer junctions, many of which are located at intersections with other routes in the network e.g. the proposed scheme crosses and will tie in with the Dodder Greenway cycle route at Robert Emmet Bridge. In addition to the above, an alternative cycle facility identified as a 'Feeder' Route in the 2022 GDA Cycle Network Plan – Dublin City Centre will be provided along Poddle Park and Via Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View. As stated above the main cycle route proposed along Kimmage Road Lower is a 'Secondary' Route.

## **5.21. Cycle Design Manual, September 2023**

- 5.21.1. The Cycle Design Manual 2023 replaced the previous 2011 National Cycle Manual and draws on the experience of cycle infrastructure development over the past decade and international best practice to help deliver safe cycle facilities for people of all ages and abilities. The Manual is intended as a live document that will be updated to reflect emerging best practice.
- 5.21.2. Chapter 2 of the Manual sets out the five main requirements (safety, coherence, directness, comfort, and attractiveness) that designs should fulfil to cater for existing cyclists and to attract new cyclists to the network. Key design principles include a network approach, segregation, and inclusive mobility. Information is also provided on the types of cycle vehicles, cycle links, appropriate facilities, and width calculations.

5.21.3. Chapter 3 of the Manual addresses cycle network planning, as well as the planning of cycling in private developments and public infrastructure projects. Designing for cycling is covered in Chapter 4,

5.21.4. The Manual makes a single reference to BusConnects under protected junctions, where it is noted that a small number of such junctions have been implemented in Ireland and many more are currently being planned under active travel schemes around the country and on BusConnects corridors in Dublin and regional cities. The Manual anticipates that the continued rollout of protected junctions will improve junction consistency and coherence on the cycle network.

## **5.22. Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019**

5.22.1. This Manual provides guidance on how to approach the design of urban streets in a more balanced way. To encourage more sustainable travel patterns and safer streets, the Manual states that designers must place the pedestrian at the top of the user hierarchy, followed by cyclists and public transport, with the private car at the bottom of the hierarchy. The following key design principles are set out to guide a more place-based/ integrated approach to road and street design.

- To support the creation of integrated street networks which promote higher levels of permeability and legibility for all users, and in particular more sustainable forms of transport.
- The promotion of multi-functional, place-based streets that balance the needs of all users within a self-regulating environment.
- The quality of the street is measured by the quality of the pedestrian environment.

- Greater communication and communication and cooperation between design professionals through the promotion of a plan-led multidisciplinary approach to design.

5.22.2. The Manual recommends that bus services should be directed along arterial and link streets and that selective bus detection technology should be considered that prioritises buses. It is noted that under used or unnecessary lanes can serve only to increase the width of carriageways (encouraging greater speeds) and can consume space that could otherwise be dedicated to placemaking /traffic calming measures.

### **5.23. Local**

Inspectors Note: The Proposed Scheme will have an overall length of approximately 3.7km (kilometres) and will be routed along Kimmage Road Lower, Harold's Cross Road, Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower, and New Street South from the Kimmage Cross Roads to the Patrick Street Junction, predominantly in the Dublin City Council (DCC) administrative area. However, a portion of the Kimmage Cross Roads is located adjoining the administrative area of South Dublin County Council (SDCC). The Proposed Scheme will involve works on existing streets to facilitate pedestrian, cyclist and bus priority as well as the widening of Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal with the construction of shared user bridges.

## 5.24. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.24.1. The main strategic approach of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028<sup>1</sup> (DCDP) is to develop a city that is low carbon, sustainable and climate resilient. Chapter 8 of the DCDP relates to sustainable movement and transport, and highlights that the sustainable and efficient movement of people and goods is crucial for the success and vitality of the city, along with the need to move away from private car and fossil-fuel-based mobility to reduce the negative impacts of transport and climate change. Towards this end Objective SMT001 states: *“To achieve and monitor a transition to more sustainable travel modes including walking, cycling and public transport over the lifetime of the development plan, in line with the city mode share targets of 26% walking/cycling/micro mobility; 57% public transport (bus/rail/Luas); and 17% private (car/van/HGV/motorcycle)”*.
- 5.24.2. Table 8.1 of the DCDP sets out current and target mode share with cycling expected to increase by 7% by 2028 and public transport (bus, rail, and Luas) by 3% in the same timeline. It is stated that the modest increase in public transport mode share anticipates the construction of major public transport infrastructure that is proposed to occur over the lifetime of the plan, and accordingly the impact of public transport infrastructure projects on modal share is more likely to come into fruition during the lifespan of the following City plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> DCDP Adopted on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of November 2022, came into effect 14<sup>th</sup> December 2022.

5.24.3. Key strategic transport projects such as the proposed Metrolink, DART+, BusConnects programme and further Luas line and rail construction and extension will continue the expansion of an integrated public transport system for the Dublin region and have the potential for a transformative impact on travel modes over the coming years. Dublin City Council actively supports all measures being implemented or proposed by other transport agencies to enhance capacity on existing lines/services and provide new infrastructure. In this regard SMT22 - Key Sustainable Transport Projects, *seeks “to support the expeditious delivery of key sustainable transport projects so as to provide an integrated public transport network with efficient interchange between transport modes, serving the existing and future needs of the city and region and to support the integration of existing public transport infrastructure with other transport modes. In particular the following projects subject to environmental requirements and appropriate planning consents being obtained: DART +, Metrolink from Charlemount to Swords, BusConnects Core Bus Corridor projects, Delivery of Luas to Finglas, Progress and delivery of Luas to Poolbeg and Lucan”.*

5.24.4. Section 8.5.3 of the DCDP notes the importance of reducing car dominance and that encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport as sustainable travel modes requires improving the attractiveness of the environment and public realm within the city and urban villages. It is recognised that there are opportunities for developing the public realm around the City and in the urban villages where new public transport proposals are being developed. The following policies are relevant in this regard:

- Policy SMT12 – Pedestrians and Public Realm: To enhance the attractiveness and liveability of the city through the continued reallocation of space to pedestrians and public realm to provide a safe and comfortable street environment for pedestrians of all ages and abilities.

- Policy SMT13 – Urban Villages and the 15-Minute City: To support the role of the urban villages in contributing to the 15-minute city through improvement of connectivity in particular for active travel and facilitating the delivery of public transport infrastructure and services, and public realm enhancement.
- Policy SMT14 City Centre Road Space: To manage city centre road-space to best address the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, public transport, shared modes, and the private car, in particular, where there are intersections between DART, Luas and Metrolink and with the existing and proposed bus network.
- SMT22 - Key Sustainable Transport Projects: To support the expeditious delivery of key sustainable transport projects so as to provide an integrated public transport network with efficient interchange between transport modes, serving the existing and future needs of the city and region and to support the integration of existing public transport infrastructure with other transport modes. In particular the following projects subject to environmental requirements and appropriate planning consents being obtained:
  - DART +
  - Metrolink from Charlemount to Swords
  - BusConnects Core Bus Corridor projects
  - Delivery of Luas to Finglas
  - Progress and delivery of Luas to Poolbeg and Lucan

5.24.5. The DCDP acknowledges that kerbside space is being continually reduced in favour of transport infrastructure and public realm improvements, and as such, there is very limited capacity on street to meet the servicing requirements of developments. Policy SMT15 – ‘Last-Mile’ Delivery seeks to “...*achieve a significant reduction in the number of motorised delivery vehicles in the City through supporting and promoting the use of the ‘last-mile’ delivery through the development of micro hubs and distribution centres.*”

5.24.6. Other transport policies of relevance to the proposed scheme include the following:

- SMT25 – On-Street Parking: “To manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements, and to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development targets such as in relation to, sustainable transport provision, greening initiatives, sustainable urban drainage, access to new developments, or public realm improvements.”
- SMT33 – Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets: “To design new streets and roads within urban areas in accordance with the principles, approaches and standards contained within the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) and to carry out upgrade works to existing road and street networks in accordance with these standards where feasible.
- SMT34 – Street and Road Design: To ensure that streets and roads within the city are designed to balance the needs and protect the safety of all road users and promote place making, sustainable movement and road safety providing a street environment that prioritises active travel and public transport whilst ensuring the needs of commercial servicing is accommodated.

5.24.7. The Proposed Scheme, for the most part, will comprise lands within the existing public road and pedestrian pavement area where there is no specific zoning objective.

Zoning objectives that are affected by the proposed scheme include:

- Zone Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.
- Zone Z2 – Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.
- Zone Z3 – Neighbourhood Centres To provide for and improve neighbourhood facilities.
- Zone Z4 – District Centres To provide for and improve mixed-services facilities.
- Zone Z6 – Employment / Enterprise To provide for the creation and protection of enterprise and facilitate opportunities for employment creation.
- Zone Z9 – Recreational amenity and open space To preserve, provide and improve recreational amenity and open space and green networks
- Z10 - Inner Suburban and Inner City Sustainable Mixed Uses)
- Z14 - Strategic Development and Regeneration Areas (SDRAs)
- Zone Z15 – Institutional and Community To protect and provide for institutional and community uses.

5.24.8. The corridor for the proposed Kimmage to City Centre scheme runs from the Kimmage Cross Roads (KCR) to the junction of New Street South and Kevin Street Upper. The scheme runs adjacent to the River Paddle for much of its length and passes through a number of Zones of Archaeological Potential for Recorded Monuments which are listed on the Record of Monuments and Places (RMP) and are subject to statutory protection under Section 12 of the National Monuments



(Amendment) Act 1994. The scheme will also impact sites listed on the Dublin City Industrial Heritage Record. Archaeological mitigation in these areas will be required where subsurface excavation is proposed.

5.24.9. The proposed construction of a boardwalk along the River Paddle will have a direct and permanent impact on the setting of Recorded Monument DU018-043003---, known as the 'Tongue' or 'Stoneboat'.

5.24.10. In total the EIAR identifies impacts on one site designated as a National Monument, eight sites listed on the Records of Monuments and Places (RMP), and five sites listed on the Dublin City Industrial Heritage Record (DCIHR). There is also a potential impact on one non designated cultural heritage site.

5.24.11. Several Protected Structures are included on the subject map sheets. These structures are located on or adjacent to the route boundary. These include 7-13 Clanbrassil Street Upper (RPS 1858- 1864), 14-20 Clanbrassil Street Upper (RPS 1865-1871), 50-55 Clanbrassil Street Upper (RPS 1872-1877), 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107 South Circular Road (RPS 1827-1836), 119, 121, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130 and 132 South Circular Road (RPS 1837-1845), 29 Clanbrassil Street lower (RPS 1857), 21 New Street South (RPS 5823), and Granite base to former public lavatories on New Street South (RPS S5822), 1-3 Waverley Terrace {RPS 8333- 8335), 23-27 Kenilworth Square North (RPS 4120-4124).

5.24.12. Buildings Listed on the NIAH include: 72/74 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH50081059), 7-8 Clanbrassil Street Upper/Wesley Place (NIAH 50080940), 12-13 Clanbrassil Street Upper/Wesley Place/Wesley Place (NIAH 50080941), 18-20 Clanbrassil Street Upper {NIAH 50080984), 50-55 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080987), Post office 65-66 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080943), Leonard's Corner Post Office 67-68 Clanbrassil Street Upper/109 South Circular Road (NIAH 50080943), 87-107 South Circular Road (NIAH 50080946), 119, South Circular Road

{NIAH 50080864), 121/123/125/127, South Circular Road (NIAH 50080865), 126/128/130/132, South Circular Road (NIAH 50080862), 29, Clanbrassil Street Lower (NIAH 50080888), Atkinson House, 21 New Street South (NIAH 50080677), Public convenience, Kevin Street Upper/New Street South (NIAH 50080678). Sisters of Saint Clare's Convent {NIAH 50081054) and Chapel (NIAH 50081053), Harold's Cross Road. 75/77 Harold's Cross Road {NIAH 50081052), 66/68/70 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH 50081060), 14-17 Clanbrassil Street Upper/Wesley Place (NIAH 50080985), 66/68/70 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH 50081060), Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080944)

5.24.13. Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) Clanbrassil Street Upper will be directly and indirectly impacted by the proposed scheme. A new independent cycle/pedestrian bridge is proposed to the west side of the bridge. The cycle/pedestrian bridge will be 24m in length and 6m in width and will include glass panels to provide edge protection. A section of the existing parapet wall adjacent to Parnell Road will be removed to allow access onto the cycle/pedestrian bridge.

5.24.14. A new pedestrian bridge is proposed to the east side of the bridge. The new pedestrian bridge will be 25m in length and 3m in width. A section of the retaining wall adjacent to Grove Road/Windsor Terrace will be demolished to facilitate construction. An ancillary ramp structure is proposed on the north-eastern side of the bridge at Windsor Terrace.

5.24.15. The proposed route does not run through any Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA) identified in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed scheme runs through Harold's Cross which has been identified as a priority ACA project during the lifetime of the current development plan.

5.24.16. The route will cross a red hatch Conservation Area (CA) at the Grand Canal. Robert Emmet Bridge is located within the red hatch Conservation Area. The

scheme maps indicated a proposed new pedestrian/cyclist bridges on the east and west sides of the bridge and significant land acquisition within the red hatch Conservation Area.

5.24.17. The route will run along the boundaries of a number of areas zoned Z2 including Terenure Road West, Poddle Park, Kimmage Road Lower, Harold's Cross Road, Clanbrassil Street Upper, South Circular Road; and Malpas Place. The route will not run along the boundaries of any areas zoned Z8 – Georgian Conservation Area.

5.24.18. Policy BHA9 refers to development in conservation areas and requires, inter-alia that development in such areas must contribute positively and take opportunities to enhance and protect the character and appearance of the area and it's setting wherever possible. BHA10 presumes against demolition or substantial loss of a structure that contributes to the character of a conservation area. As stated, the proposed scheme passes a number of protected structures, Policy BHA2 of the DCDP relates to development of protected structures and requires that development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage, and inter-alia:

- Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance,
- Ensure that any modification affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout, and materials.
- Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the protected structure is retained.
- Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers etc.
- Ensure historic landscapes, gardens, and trees (in good condition) associated with the protected structures are protected from inappropriate development.

5.24.19. There are four Industrial Heritage sites identified in the study area. These include sections of former tramway at Harold's Cross Road and Clanbrassil Street Lower (DCIHR 18\_15\_030). Infrastructure associated with the tramway may survive below the road surface. St. Kevin's Hall on Clanbrassil Street Upper is located on the site of a former weaving mill (DCIHR 18\_11\_100).

5.24.20. The following Historic Paving and Granite Kerbing is located along the proposed scheme:

- Narrow granite kerbs to Lower Kimmage Road (CBC0011BTH129, CBC0011BTH120, CBC0011BTH140)
- Broad and narrow granite kerbs, Rathgar Avenue (CBC0011BTH130)
- Granite kerbs 182-194 Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH127, CBC0011BTH119), St.
- Clare's Convent Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH128), west side Harold's Cross

Road (CBC00118TH123);

- Granite kerbing at 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH167) will be repositioned as part of the scheme.
- Cobbled surface at entrance to Harold's Cross Green (CBC00118TH199)
- Wide granite kerbing to east and west sides of Robert Emmet Bridge, likely salvaged from late 18th century canal bridge (CBC0011BTH135) will be repositioned as part of the scheme.
- Narrow granite kerbs 40-68 Clanbrassil Street Upper (CBC0011BTH124)
- Diorite kerbing 35-45 Clanbrassil Street Lower (CBC0011BTH125)
- Cobbled surface to laneway to 20 Clanbrassil Street Upper (CBC0011BTH204)
- Cellar hatches 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH164, CBC0011BTH165, CBC0011BTH166, CBC0011BTH162, CBC0011BTH163, CBC0011BTH160, CBC0011BTH161, CBC0011BTH159, CBC0011BTH157, CBC0011BTH158)
- Cellar hatches 34-35 Clanbrassil Street Upper (CBC0011BTH169, CBC0011BTH170}

5.24.21. The following Lamp Posts and Tram Standards are located along the proposed scheme:

- There are groups of historic lamp posts along the route at Kenilworth Square North (CBC0011LP034}, Kenilworth Square West (CBC0011LP035-39), Kenilworth Park (CBC0011LP026-33), Waverly Terrace (CBC0012LP027-28), and Harold's Cross Road (CBC1012LP118).
- There is a historic tram standard at Harold's Cross Road (CBC1012LP118).
- The historic tram standard at Zuma Terrace {CBC1011LP040) will be

removed during construction works associated with the scheme and subsequently replaced.

- There are reproduction lamp standards at Clanbrassil Street Lower (CBC0011LP001 to CBC0011LP018) and New Street South (CBC0011LP019 to CBC0011LP032, CBC0809LP031). The majority of these will require removal during construction works associated with the scheme and will be subsequently replaced.

5.24.22. Other Street Furniture along the route includes:

- A war memorial cross to north end of Harold's Cross Park is located within the site boundary.
- A historic post box at Sundrive Road is located within the scheme boundary and will be relocated; a wall mounted post box at the entrance to Mount Argus is within scheme boundary; and a historic post box at the junction between Clanbrassil Street Lower and Harty Place is located within the scheme boundary.

## **5.25. South Dublin County Development Plan (SDCCDP) 2022-2028<sup>2</sup>**

5.25.1. The proposed scheme boundary abuts and is adjacent to the South Dublin County Council Administrative Boundary at Kimmage Cross Roads (notably the junction of Kimmage Road Lower, Terenure Road West, Kimmage Road West, Fortfield Road)

- Chapter 7 Sustainable Movement: Policy SMI: 'Promote ease of movement within, and access to South Dublin County, by integrating sustainable land-use planning with a high-quality sustainable transport and movement network for people and goods'.

---

<sup>2</sup> SDCCDP 2022 – 2028 was adopted on 22/06/2022 and came into effect on 03/08/2022.

- SMI Objective 1: 'To achieve and monitor a transition to more sustainable travel modes including walking, cycling and public transport over the lifetime of the County Development Plan, in line with the County mode share targets of 15% Walk; 10% Cycle; 20% Bus; 5% Rail; and 50% Private (Car/Van/ HGV I Motorcycle)'.
- SMI Objective 3: 'To support the delivery of key sustainable transport projects including DART and Luas expansion programmes, BusConnects and the Greater Dublin Metropolitan Cycle Network in accordance with RPO 5.2 of the RSES / MASP'.
- SMI Objective 4: 'To ensure that future development is planned and designed in a manner that facilitates sustainable travel patterns, with a particular focus on increasing the share of active modes (walking and cycling) and public transport use and creating a safe and attractive street environment for pedestrians and cyclists, in accordance with RPO 5.3 of the RSES / MASP'.
- Policy SM2: Walking and Cycling 'Re-balance movement priorities towards sustainable modes of travel by prioritising the development of walking and cycling facilities and encouraging a shift to active travel for people of all ages and abilities, in line with the County targets'. SM2 Objective 8: 'To work with the NTA to acquire funding and secure full implementation of the Cycle South Dublin programme and actions which may arise from the sustainable movement studies carried out to inform the plan'.
- SM2 Objective 9: 'To work with the NTA to review the feasibility of implementing additional cycling facilities within the major urban and recreational areas of the County'.
- Policy SM3: Public Transport 'Promote a significant shift from car-based travel to public transport in line with County targets and facilitate the sustainable

development of the County by supporting and guiding national agencies in delivering major improvements to the public transport network’.

- SM3 Objective 1: ‘To achieve and monitor a transition to the County mode share targets of 20% Bus and 5% Rail’.
- SM3 Objective 3: ‘To ensure that future development is planned in such a manner as to facilitate a significant shift to public transport use through pursuing compact growth policies, consolidating development around existing and planned public transport routes and interchanges, and maximising access to existing and planned public transport services throughout the network’.
- SM3 Objective 4: ‘To optimise accessibility to public transport, increase catchment and maximise permeability through the creation of new and upgrading of existing walking and cycling routes linking to public transport stops’.
- Policy SM3: Public Transport - Bus
- SM3 Objective 11: ‘To facilitate the delivery of the BusConnects Core Bus Corridors and seek additional bus corridor and orbital routes to serve the County by securing and maintaining any required route reservations and to ensure the BusConnects Corridors do not adversely affect the village life and livelihoods of any of our County Villages’.
- SM3 Objective 12: ‘To work with the NTA to secure the expansion of the bus network, including distinct new bus networks as necessary, to serve new development and regeneration areas within the South Dublin County area including Tallaght, City Edge, Adamstown, Clonburris, Fortunestown, Ballycullen and Newcastle’.
- SM3 Objective 17: ‘To work with the NTA and other state agencies to facilitate the delivery of the Kennelsfort Road-R148 grade separated junction or an equivalent solution to maximise the efficacy of the BusConnects Project’.



- SM3 Objective 18: ‘To liaise with bus service providers where new bus stop infrastructure is proposed in order to ensure facilities such as shelters and bins are included, where appropriate’.

## **5.26. Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy – 2022-2042**

This strategy replaces the previous GDA Transport Strategy 2016-2035. Busconnects is identified as a major project which is provided for within this strategy. The NTA has invested heavily in the renewal of the bus infrastructure, including bus stopping facilities, Real Time Passenger Information and fleet improvements and has commenced the largest ever investment programme in our bus network under BusConnects Dublin.

The Strategy recognises the government’s commitment to sustainable mobility as outlined in NSO 4 of the National Development Plan 2021-2030.

Busconnects is identified as an essential to protecting access to Dublin Airport, ensuring that the Airport will operate in a sustainable fashion in terms of landside transport.

- Measure INT2 – International Gateways

It is the intention of the NTA, in conjunction with public transport operators, TII, and the local authorities, to serve the international gateways with the landside transport infrastructure and services which will facilitate their sustainable operation. Throughout the lifetime of the strategy, the NTA will continue to work with Dublin Port Company, other port and harbour operators and DAA in respect of Dublin Airport, in monitoring, assessing and delivering these transport requirements.

Major transport interchanges are recognised as an integral part of the bus connects project.

- Measure INT5 – Major Interchanges and Mobility Hubs

It is the intention of the NTA, in conjunction with TII, Irish Rail, local authorities, and landowners to deliver high quality major interchange facilities or Mobility Hubs at appropriate locations served by high capacity public transport services. These will be designed to be as seamless as possible and will incorporate a wide range of facilities as appropriate such as cycle parking, seating, shelter, kiosks selling refreshments plus the provision of travel information in printed and digital formats.

The NTA recognises that the construction of major projects including bus connects will cause disruption and it will seek to minimise such impacts through up-to-date travel information.

- Section 11.4 Cycle Infrastructure Provision and Management
- Section 12.2 Bus
- Measure BUS1 – Core Bus Corridor Programme

Subject to receipt of statutory consents, it is the intention of the NTA to implement the 12 Core Bus Corridors as set out in the BusConnects Dublin programme

- Measure BUS2 – Additional Radial Core Bus Corridors

It is the intention of the NTA to evaluate the need for, and deliver, additional priority on radial corridors.

- Measure BUS3 – Orbital and Local Bus Routes

It is the intention of the NTA to provide significant improvements to orbital and local bus services in the following ways: 1. Increased frequencies on the BusConnects orbital and local services; and 2. Providing bus priority measures at locations on the routes where delays to services are identified.

- Section 12.2.4 Zero Emissions Buses

The transition to a zero emissions urban bus fleet for the State operated bus services has begun under BusConnects. Under the BusConnects Dublin programme, the full Dublin Area urban bus fleet will have transitioned to zero or low emission vehicles by 2030 and will have been converted to a full zero emission bus fleet by 2035.

- Measure BUS6 – Higher Capacity Bus Fleet

In the later phases of the Transport Strategy period, it is the intention of the NTA to introduce higher capacity bus vehicles onto select appropriate BusConnects corridors in order to increase passenger carrying capabilities in line with forecast demand.

- 12.2.8 New Bus Stops and Shelters

Bus shelter provision will be significantly expanded as part of the BusConnects Dublin programme and Connecting Ireland (section 12.2.7).

- 13.8 Road space Reallocation

In line with transport policies and objectives to reduce car dependency and to favour sustainable modes over the private car, and as a means of achieving reductions in carbon emissions, it is the intention to reallocate roadspace from its current use for general traffic to the exclusive use by walking, cycling and public transport. This approach is applicable generally across the GDA, and in addition to the reallocation proposed under BusConnects.

- Measure Road 13 – Roadspace Reallocation

The local authorities and the NTA will implement a programme of roadspace reallocation from use by general traffic or as parking to exclusive use by sustainable modes as appropriate, as a means of achieving the following: y Providing sufficient capacity for sustainable modes; y Improving safety for

pedestrians and cyclists; and y Encouraging mode shift from the private car and reducing emissions.

#### **5.27. Dublin City Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2025.**

The Dublin City Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2025 (DCC Biodiversity Plan) recognises that in addition to legally designated sites there are numerous habitats across the city that have conservation value for biodiversity, including public parks and open spaces, rivers, canals, and embankments. The DCC Biodiversity Plan sets out five themes supported by objectives and actions, these themes are set out below:

- Maintaining Nature in the City.
- Restoring Nature in the City.
- Building for Biodiversity.
- Understanding Biodiversity in the City
- Partnering for Biodiversity.

The objectives of the DCC Biodiversity Plan include:

- Objective 4 – Monitor and conserve legally-protected species within Dublin City, particularly those listed in the annexes of the EU Birds and Habitats Directive,
- Objective 11 – Ensure that measures for biodiversity and nature-based solutions are incorporated into new building projects, retrofit and maintenance works, and
- Objective 12 which promotes net biodiversity gain.

## **5.28. Legislative Context**

- 5.29. Under Section 51(2) of the Roads Act, 1993 (as amended by Section 9(1)(e)(i) of the Roads Act, 2007), a road authority shall apply to the Board for the approval of a proposed road development and shall submit to the Board an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) in respect of the development. The proposed road development shall not be carried out unless the Board has approved it or approved it with modifications. The Board shall ensure that it has, or have access as necessary to, sufficient expertise to examine the EIAR.
- 5.30. Before approval of the proposed road development, consideration must be given to the EIAR, any additional information, any submissions made in relation to the likely effects on the environment of the proposed road development, and the report and any recommendation of the person conducting any inquiry. Taking into account the preceding, the Board shall reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed road development on the environment.

## **5.31. Heritage Designations and EIA**

## **5.32. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.33. The Proposed Scheme does not overlap with any European site. The following Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas are in the vicinity of the proposed development:

### **SAC's**

- North Dublin Bay SAC,
- South Dublin Bay SAC,
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC,
- Howth Head SAC,

- Wicklow Mountains SAC,
- Knocksink Wood SAC,
- Ballyman Glen SAC,
- Baldoyle Bay SAC,
- Glenasmole Valley SAC,
- Rye Water Valley / Carton SAC
- Irelands Eye SAC,
- Malahide Estuary SAC,
- Rogerstown Estuary SAC
- Lambay Island SAC,

#### **SPA's**

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,
- North Bull Island SPA,
- Dalkey Islands SPA,
- Wicklow Mountains SPA,
- Baldoyle Bay SPA,
- Howth Head Coast SPA,
- Ireland's Eye SPA,
- Malahide Estuary SPA,
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA,
- Lambay Island SPA
- The Murrough SPA
- Skerries Islands SPA and,
- Rockabill SPA,
- North West Irish Sea cSPA

A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been prepared with regard to the following European Sites and has been submitted to the Board in respect of the proposed road development under Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). I have taken the information as provided within the applicants NIS and I consider that the North West Irish Sea cSPA should be included in the interest of consistency, Special Conservation Interest (SCI) and Qualifying Interest (QI) habitats and therefore it is included within the following list:

- North Dublin Bay SAC,
- South Dublin Bay SAC,
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC,
- Lambay Island SAC,
- Howth Head Coast SPA,
- North Bull Island SPA,
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,
- Dalkey Islands SPA,
- Malahide Estuary SPA,
- Baldoyle Bay SPA,
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA,
- Skerries Islands SPA,
- Ireland's Eye SPA,
- Lambay Island SPA,
- Rockabill SPA,
- The Murrough SPA and
- North west Irish Sea cSPA.

#### **5.34. EIA Screening**

**5.35.** The NTA has submitted, to the Board, an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) prepared in accordance with section 50 of the Roads Act 1993 (as amended) and Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and Council, 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 in respect of the proposed road development.

## **6.0 Assessment**

### **6.1. Introduction.**

- 6.1.1. A substantial amount of information has been submitted to the Board in relation to this project throughout the application process. The planning assessment below has had regard to all the information provided, including the original application documentation, all submissions and observations lodged by third parties (including prescribed bodies), the response to the submissions lodged by the applicant and subsequent further third-party submissions following circulation of that response.
- 6.1.2. I have read all the documentation on file including the EIAR, NIS, planning report and supporting documentation submitted with the application. I have visited the subject site and its surroundings. I have read in full the observations submitted in respect of the application including the third-party observations, the observations from the relevant Planning Authorities as well as the observations from prescribed bodies. Having regard to all the information that has been received, I consider that the key issues for consideration by the Board in this case are as follows:
- Policy Context/Principle,
  - Justification and Need for the Proposed Scheme,
  - Reliability of the Traffic Modelling, Data Counts and up to Date Nature of the Information.
  - Adequacy of Consultation.
  - Route Selection/Alternatives Considered.
  - Project/Junction Design,
  - Issues raised in submissions.



- Impacts for Businesses.
- Bus Stops.
- Pedestrian Facilities and Public Realm.
- Provision for Cyclists.
- Removal of Parking / Loading Bays.
- Private Cars / Impact on Commercial / Service Community Premises.
- Built Heritage /Cultural Heritage/Architectural Heritage.
- Visual Impact/Townscape.
- Biodiversity.
- Residential Amenity.
- Other Issues.
- Recommended Conditions.

## 6.2. Policy Context & Principle

### National Level

- 6.2.1. The **Climate Action Plan, 2024** (CAP24), introduces carbon budgets and sectoral emissions ceilings for different sectors of the Irish economy. The Avoid-Shift-Improve Framework is outlined to achieve a net zero decarbonisation pathway for the transport sector, whereby actions are prioritised to *avoid* the need to travel; *shift* to more environmentally friendly modes; and to *improve* the energy efficiency of vehicle technology.
- 6.2.2. The proposed BusConnects programme includes road space reallocation, which is a measure outlined under both ‘avoid’ and ‘shift’ to promote active travel and modal

shift to public transport. Road space reallocation can discourage car use, with valuable street space being redirected from on-street parking and public urban roadways to bus lanes, segregated cycle tracks, more spacious footpaths, and public realm improvements. BusConnects is also seen as a key action under the major public transport infrastructure programme to deliver abatement in transport emissions, as outlined in CAP24 for the period 2024-2025.

- 6.2.3. It should be noted, however, that BusConnects was designed under a previous Climate Action Plan and the Avoid-Shift-Improve Framework was new to CAP23 and has been applied again in CAP24. Whilst road space reallocation forms one of the main components of the Proposed Scheme, the assessment hereunder will, amongst other aspects of the assessment, seek to establish if such reallocation goes far enough to achieve a proper balance in the use of road space, in compliance with all levels of policy.
- 6.2.4. **The National Planning Framework** outlines a set of goals expressed as ten National Strategic Outcomes (NSO) to deliver shared benefits for communities across the country. Of most relevance to the proposed Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor is National Strategic Outcome - Sustainable Mobility, which recognises the need to move away from combustion engine driven transport systems. This will be achieved through the expansion of public transport alternatives to car transport, thereby reducing congestion and emissions, and catering for the demands associated with longer term population and employment growth.
- 6.2.5. The Proposed Scheme will also help to deliver other NSO's relating to compact growth and transition to a low carbon and climate resilient society. The Proposed Scheme can therefore be viewed as a wider integrated land use and transportation plan that sets out to fulfil the National Strategic Outcomes and National Policy Objectives of the NPF. Of particular relevance are, National Policy Objective 27,

which aims to “*ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments, and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages*”; and National Planning Objective 54, which targets a “*reduction in carbon footprint by integrating climate action into the planning system in support of national targets for climate policy mitigation and adaptation objectives, as well as targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions.*”

- 6.2.6. National Policy Objective 35 seeks to “*increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.*” As can be seen in the following section, this objective is being implemented along the core bus corridor through the large volume of higher density development. High density development and high-quality public transport accords with NPO64 through integrated land use and spatial planning that supports public transport, walking and cycling.
- 6.2.7. The **National Development Plan** makes provision for investment in public transport and sustainable mobility solutions, with BusConnects being recognised as one of the Major Regional Investments for the Eastern and Midlands Region. It is stated that BusConnects will overhaul the current bus system in Dublin, Cork, Galway, Limerick and Waterford by implementing ‘next generation’ bus corridors (including segregated cycle facilities). This will be enabled through **The National Investment Framework for Transport in Ireland**.

#### Regional Level

- 6.2.8. The **Eastern & Midlands Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy** (RSES) provides an investment framework and climate action strategy to support the implementation of Project Ireland 2040 (National Planning Framework and National Development

Plan) at a regional level. The Strategy includes the Dublin Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP), which is an integrated land use and transportation strategy that sets out guiding principles for the sustainable development of the Dublin Metropolitan Area. This plan seeks to focus growth along existing and proposed high quality public transport corridors in the interests of transport and land use integration and to support the delivery of BusConnects and other major transport programmes.

- 6.2.9. RSES also states that the future development in the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall be planned and designed in a manner that facilitates sustainable travel patterns, with a particular focus on increasing the share of active modes (walking and cycling), in addition to public transport use, and the creation of a safe attractive street environment for pedestrians and cyclists. This is reflected in the BusConnects programme whereby streets and public spaces are being redesigned to prioritise active transport modes and bus transport as alternatives to the car.
- 6.2.10. BusConnects forms a key part of the overall aim of the **Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area, 2022-2042** to provide a sustainable, accessible and effective transport system for the Greater Dublin Area which meets the region's climate change requirements, serves the needs of urban and rural communities, and supports the regional economy. The proposed Kimmage to City Centre CBC scheme is one of 12 radial schemes being brought forward under this programme to facilitate faster and more reliable bus journeys on the busiest bus corridors in the Dublin region.
- 6.2.11. BusConnects accords with the specific measures outlined in the Strategy to incorporate a high standard of urban design and placemaking into major public transport infrastructure schemes and walking and cycling projects, taking account of architectural heritage (PLAN14 and PLAN15). The reallocation of road space to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport use and the placemaking functions of

the urban street network (PLAN16) also form key considerations within the BusConnects network design.

- 6.2.12. The updated **Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan** is published alongside the Transport Strategy. Cycle facilities proposed under BusConnects will contribute towards the intention of the NTA and local authorities to deliver a safe, comprehensive, attractive and legible cycle network in accordance with the updated Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network.
- 6.2.13. As referenced in Section 2.2.1.4, as part of the GDACNP 2013, there are two primary radial cycle routes (radial cycle routes 9 and 9B) and one primary orbital cycle route (N10), as well as three secondary orbital cycle routes (including S01, S02, S03) along the route of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.2.14. The Proposed Scheme will help to deliver the Cycle Network through installation of cycle tracks and safer junctions, many of which are located at intersections with other routes in the network. In addition to the above, an alternative cycle facility identified as a 'Feeder' Route in the 2022 GDA Cycle Network Plan – Dublin City Centre will be provided along Poddle Park and Via Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View.
- 6.2.15. Changes between the 2022 Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network and GDACNP 2013 include:
- The cycle route along Kimmage Road Lower is now a Secondary rather than a Primary route;
  - North of the Grand Canal, the cycle route along Clanbrassil Street is now a Primary rather than a Secondary route; and
  - The Poddle Greenway has been omitted and replaced by sections of feeder route that generally follow the river along quiet residential streets.

### Local Policy

- 6.2.16. The proposed CBC is located within Dublin City Council and abuts South Dublin County Council administrative area at Kimmage Cross Roads (at the junction of Kimmage Road Lower, Terenure Road West, Kimmage Road West, Fortfield Road.)
- 6.2.17. The current operative plan for each local authority is the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the South Dublin Development Plan 2022 - 2028
- 6.2.18. The Sustainable Movement and Transport chapter of **Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028** highlights that the sustainable and efficient movement of people and goods is crucial for the success and vitality of the city, along with the need to move away from private car and fossil-fuel-based mobility to reduce the negative impacts of transport and climate change.
- 6.2.19. It is acknowledged that the impact of public transport infrastructure projects, such as BusConnects, on mode share is more likely to come into fruition during the lifespan of the following Development Plan. Notwithstanding this, Dublin City Council under Policy SMT22 – Key Sustainable Transport Projects supports the delivery of an integrated public transport network serving existing and future needs of the city.
- 6.2.20. Improvements to the environment and public realm will be necessary to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use and the opportunities are recognised for developing public realm when new public transport proposals are being developed. This will be implemented through the BusConnects programme facilitating active travel and public transport improvements and associated public realm improvements.
- 6.2.21. The integration of active travel with public transport will comply with Policy SMT19 which seeks *“to work with the relevant transport providers, agencies and stakeholders to facilitate the integration of active travel (walking/cycling etc.) with*

*public transport, ensuring ease of access for all.”* Dublin City Council has actively engaged with the NTA during the consultation process.

6.2.22. With respect to transport and sustainable movement under Policy SMT34 – Street and Road Design, Dublin City Council seeks *“to ensure that streets and roads within the city are designed to balance the needs and protect the safety of all road users and promote place making, sustainable movement and road safety providing a street environment that prioritises active travel and public transport whilst ensuring the needs of commercial servicing is accommodated.”*

6.2.23. **The South Dublin County Council Development Plan (SDCCCDP) 2022 – 2028** is in favour of the principle of the proposed scheme with a supportive policy context. Policy SMI within Chapter 7 ‘Sustainable Movement’ of the SDCCCDP seeks to ‘Promote ease of movement within, and access to South Dublin County, by integrating sustainable land-use planning with a high-quality sustainable transport and movement network for people and goods’. **SMI Objective 1:** seeks ‘To achieve and monitor a transition to more sustainable travel modes including walking, cycling and public transport over the lifetime of the County Development Plan, in line with the County mode share targets of 15% Walk; 10% Cycle; 20% Bus; 5% Rail; and 50% Private (Car/Van/ HGV I Motorcycle)’. It is notable that **SMI Objective 3:** seeks ‘To support the delivery of key sustainable transport projects including DART and Luas expansion programmes, BusConnects and the Greater Dublin Metropolitan Cycle Network in accordance with RPO 5.2 of the RSES / MASP’. There are numerous policies and objectives to ensure that future development is planned in such a manner as to facilitate a significant shift to public transport use, and maximising access to existing and planned public transport services throughout the network. **SM3 Objective 4** seeks: ‘To optimise accessibility to public transport, increase catchment and maximise permeability through the creation of new and upgrading of existing walking and cycling

routes linking to public transport stops'. With respect to BusConnects, Policy SM3: Public Transport – Bus and **SM3 Objective 11 seeks**: 'To facilitate the delivery of the BusConnects Core Bus Corridors and seek additional bus corridor and orbital routes to serve the County by securing and maintaining any required route reservations and to ensure the BusConnects Corridors do not adversely affect the village life and livelihoods of any of our County Villages'.

- 6.2.24. The Proposed Scheme will provide the infrastructure to deliver a modal shift from private car usage to sustainable transport and will facilitate sustainable growth by delivering the transport infrastructure necessary to provide a high quality and more efficient and reliable public transport network.
- 6.2.25. Overall, the proposed BusConnects programme remains an integral and pivotal part of the requirement to tackle climate change and to enable a meaningful shift within the transport sector to active and sustainable transport modes. I would be satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in principle and follows the consistent message within all levels of policy that there must be a transition to a low carbon and climate resilient society. This requires a reduction in car dependency to contribute towards lower energy consumption, CO<sub>2</sub> levels and pollutant emissions. Sustainable mobility, compact growth and land use and transportation integration are essential for the creation of sustainable communities that minimise private car use, prioritise cycling, walking and public transport and promote the efficient use of land. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development is in accordance with the policy objectives set out in various plans and documentation referred to above.

### **6.3. Justification and Need for the Proposed Scheme,**

- 6.3.1. Within the extents of the Proposed Scheme route, bus priority infrastructure is currently provided along approximately 24% (citybound) and 6.5% (outbound),



cumulatively equating to approximately 15% of the length of the route. The Proposed Scheme will facilitate 100% bus priority and complement the rollout of the Dublin Area Bus Network Redesign to deliver improved bus services on the route. This will improve journey times for bus, enhance its reliability and provide resilience to congestion.

- 6.3.2. One of the key objectives of the Proposed Scheme is to enhance interchange between the various modes of public transport operating in the city and wider metropolitan area. The CBC Infrastructure Works, including the Proposed Scheme, are being developed to provide improved existing or new interchange opportunities with other existing and planned transport services, including:
- DART stations
  - Existing Dublin Bus and other bus services
  - The GDACNP 2013 (NTA 2013) and 2022 Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network (NTA 2022c)
  - Future public transport proposals such as the DART + Programme and MetroLink and
  - Supporting the ongoing roll out of Dublin Bus Network Re-design as part of BusConnects.

- 6.3.3. The Proposed Scheme has an overall length of approximately 3.7km and will commence on R817 Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with the R818 on Terenure Road West and Kimmage Road West, and R817 Fortfield Road. The Proposed Scheme will continue along R817 Kimmage Road Lower towards the City Centre, via the R137 on Harold's Cross Road, Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South. Priority for buses will be provided along the entire route, consisting primarily of dedicated bus lanes in both directions, where feasible, with

alternative measures proposed at particularly constrained locations such as much of R817 Kimmage Road Lower, Harold's Cross Park West and short sections of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower in alternate directions. A complementary cycle route is also proposed to the west of the Proposed Scheme via quiet streets at the southern end of the Proposed Scheme.

6.3.4. There are many local destinations along the Proposed Scheme that generate demand for public transport, walking and cycling for local trips as follows:

- Employment sites west of R817 Kimmage Road Lower at Ravensdale Park and Cashel Road at the southern end.
- Terenure Village which is 1km to the east of the Proposed Scheme and Crumlin Village, which is 1km to the west, attract east to west movements across the Proposed Scheme at Kimmage Cross-Roads.
- Various schools in the surrounding catchment area that attract movements along and across the Proposed Scheme, including in Terenure to the south, at Clareville Road to the east, at Clogher Road to the west, and one existing and two new schools in Harold's Cross.
- A local retail and business cluster on R817 Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with Corrib Road near the southern end.
- The village centre of Kimmage at Sundrive Cross with a large cluster of retail and other businesses.
- Mount Argus Church.
- Mount Jerome Cemetery in Harold's Cross.
- Harold's Cross Village to the east and Harold's Cross Park; and
- The urban village at Leonard's Corner, at South Circular Road in Portobello.

- 6.3.5. There is considerable demand for transport both along the corridor, and further afield from the onward connections to the route at the southern end linking from the Templeogue and Greenhills areas. Local demand arises from the extensive residential catchment area along the corridor for travel to and from the City Centre.
- 6.3.6. The Proposed Scheme has been designed to facilitate improved efficiency of the transport network through the improvement of infrastructure for active (walking and cycling) and public transport modes making them attractive alternatives to car-based journeys. Central to the design is the optimisation of roadway space with a focus on the movement of people rather than vehicles along the route and through the junctions. A typical double-deck bus takes up the same road space as three standard cars but typically carries 50 to 100 times the number of passengers per vehicle. On average, a typical double-deck bus carries approximately 60 to 70 passengers, making the bus typically 20 times more efficient in providing people movement capacity within the equivalent spatial area of three cars. These efficiency gains can provide a significant reduction in road network congestion where the equivalent car capacity would require 50 or more vehicles based on average occupancy levels. Consequently, by prioritising the movement of buses over cars, significantly more people can be transported along the limited road space available. Similarly, cyclists and pedestrians require significantly less roadway space than general traffic users to move safely and efficiently along the route. Making space for improved pedestrian infrastructure and segregated cycle tracks can significantly benefit these sustainable modes and encourage greater use of these modes.
- 6.3.7. The Proposed Scheme design involves the prioritisation of People Movement, focusing on maximising the throughput of sustainable modes (i.e. walking, cycling and bus modes). A quantitative people-movement assessment, as part of the transport impact assessment, facilitates a comparison of the Do Minimum and Do

Something peak-hour scenarios for the forecast years (Opening Year (2028) and Design Year (2043)). The benefits resulting from the 2028 AM Peak Hour people-movement assessment shows that there is an increase of 80% in the number of people travelling by bus, an increase of 8% in the number of people walking or cycling, and a reduction of 50% in the number of people travelling by car along the route of the Proposed Scheme.

- 6.3.8. There is a steady growth in bus patronage all along the Proposed Scheme and at the northern end of the Proposed Scheme, there are an estimated 700 additional passengers per hour in the inbound direction in the morning peak hour (2028) compared to the Do-Minimum scenario.
- 6.3.9. It is notable that currently within the existing extents of the Proposed Scheme, there are no permanently segregated cycle tracks. This will increase to 100% in both directions with 47% being fully segregated, and the remainder on quiet streets, both within the Bus Gate section along Kimmage Road Lower, and along the parallel Poddle Cycleway. In addition to this, the significant segregation and safety improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure that is a key feature of the Proposed Scheme will further maximise the movement of people travelling sustainably along the corridor. All of these changes combined will therefore cater for higher levels of future sustainable population and employment growth.
- 6.3.10. The Proposed Scheme will make significant improvements to pedestrian infrastructure through the provision of increased signal crossings, introduction of traffic calming measures, improved accessibility, increased pedestrian directness and increased footpath and crossing widths. The number of pedestrian signal crossings on main roads between junctions will increase from five to nine (+80%) in the Proposed Scheme. In addition, the pedestrian crossing facilities at three of the existing 10 junctions will be improved through the provision of additional crossings to

enable more direct and convenient pedestrian movements. The Proposed Scheme design has been developed with cognisance to the relevant accessibility guidance. It is anticipated that the overall quality of pedestrian infrastructure will improve as a result of the Proposed Scheme. This aligns with the overarching aim to provide enhanced walking infrastructure on the corridor. The improved walking and cycling measures that the Proposed Scheme will provide will enhance the potential to grow these modes into the future.

- 6.3.11. I acknowledge that the proposed development will increase the effectiveness and attractiveness of bus services operating along the corridor and will result in more people benefiting from faster journey times and improved journey time reliability. This in turn will facilitate the increase in the bus network capacity of services operating along the corridor and thereby further increase the attractiveness of public transport. In addition, the significant segregation and safety improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure that are a key feature of the Proposed Scheme will further maximise the movement of people travelling sustainably along the corridor and will therefore cater for higher levels of future sustainable population and employment growth. In the absence of the delivery of the Proposed Scheme, growth along this key corridor would continue to contribute to increased congestion and operational issues on the road network. The Proposed Scheme will deliver a reliable alternative to car-based travel that can support future sustainable growth and provide a positive contribution towards reducing carbon emissions.
- 6.3.12. The proposed development is being developed in response to the need for a sustainable, reliable form of public transport along the route to and from the City Centre. Sustainable transport infrastructure is known to assist in creating more sustainable communities and healthier places to live and work while also stimulating

economic development and also contributes to enhanced health and well-being when delivered effectively.

- 6.3.13. According to the National Planning Framework, 2018, the population of the Greater Dublin Area is forecast to increase by 25% by 2040 and this growth will have associated travel demands, placing added pressure on the transport system. Significant congestion already occurs throughout the GDA from private car dependence and intervention is therefore required to optimise road space and prioritise the movement of people over the movement of vehicles.
- 6.3.14. At present, the reliability and effectiveness of existing bus and cycle infrastructure on key radial traffic routes into and out of Dublin city centre is compromised by a lack of bus lanes and segregated cycle tracks. Furthermore, existing bus lanes are often shared with parking and cyclists and are not always operational on a 24 hour basis.
- 6.3.15. One of the overriding motivation for BusConnects is to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and this is critical from a global climatic perspective. The proposed scheme is specifically identified and supported within the Climate Action Plan 2024 and is seen as a key action under the major public transport infrastructure programme to deliver abatement in transport emissions. The scheme is also identified within the National Sustainable Mobility Policy document and the accompanying action plan as a key piece of infrastructure to be delivered to achieve reductions in emissions and provide for more efficient cities in terms of accessibility for all. The scheme is also seen as an economic driver within the cities which currently experience significant congestion and impediments to movement and accessibility.
- 6.3.16. At the local and shorter-term level, the issue of congestion is more obvious, and both congestion and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are continuing to rise. Any further increases in traffic levels will see an exacerbation of congestion, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and of all of the associated issues highlighted above. Private car dependence will worsen unless

there is intervention to optimise road space and prioritise the movement of people over the movement of vehicles.

- 6.3.17. It is important to note that the Kimmage Corridor serves some of the busiest bus routes in Dublin. Congestion is already a common experience along this route, and without appropriate intervention the additional population and forecasted economic growth will increase traffic volumes and potentially lead to gridlock becoming a common feature along the route. Planning and transport policy all clearly point to the need to provide a better alternative to facilitate increased people movement along transport corridors to reduce emissions and congestion which adversely effects the population, economy and climate.
- 6.3.18. It has been demonstrated above that Kimmage to city centre BusConnects scheme is identified as a component of a Strategic Investment Priority which has been determined as central to the delivery of the National Planning Framework. The proposed scheme is also consistent with all levels national, regional and local policy relating to climate action and sustainable transport provision.
- 6.3.19. As highlighted above, the proposed scheme serves some of the busiest bus routes in Dublin. Demand for travel by bus is anticipated to continue to grow in this corridor into the future, in line with population growth. I draw the Board's attention to the list of planning applications for residential / BTR / student accommodation / hotel accommodation / mixed use development, within the planning history section of this report above.
- 6.3.20. The proposed scheme, therefore, will deliver the physical infrastructure necessary to sustain the projected population growth along and within the area of the route. It will also provide a more accessible, safe, segregated, reliable, efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service.

6.3.21. In conclusion, it is clear in my opinion, that there is an obvious need and justification for the proposed scheme which has been clearly demonstrated from a population growth and congestion perspective and in the interests of land use and transport planning integration. It is also clear from the abundance of policy documents and plans at both an EU, national and local level that the proposed scheme is supported throughout all levels of government policy and therefore is justified and acceptable in principle.

#### **6.4. Reliability of the traffic modelling, data counts and up to date nature of the information.**

6.4.1. It is of note that concerns were raised in relation to predicted vehicle movements / traffic modelling at Kimmage Road Lower / Ravensdale Park. Concern is also raised with regard to traffic increases on various roads listed in the EIAR Table 6-53 (Road Links that Experience an Increase of at least +100 Combined Flows (Indirect study area, PM Peak Hour)) More localised traffic modelling is sought in the vicinity of Harold's Cross Road. Concern is raised that up-to-date traffic modelling and counts have not been used and that modelling is adequate, robust and can be relied upon.

6.4.2. The response to this concern should be read in conjunction with the traffic and transport assessment of the EIAR. As set out in paragraph 9.2.88 in the EIAR section of this report, the results of analysis demonstrate that the majority of junctions are operating at a maximum volume to capacity (V / C) ratio of below 85% during the AM and PM Peak Hour in the 2028 scenario. This indicates that these junctions are operating well, with spare capacity that could accommodate additional traffic that may occur as a result of traffic redistribution following the delivery of the proposed scheme.



- 6.4.3. I highlight that, it is determined that there will be an overall Negative, Slight and Long-Term impact from the redistributed general traffic as a result of the Proposed Scheme. Given that the redistributed traffic will not lead to a significant deterioration of the operational capacity on the surrounding road network, no further mitigation measures have been considered to alleviate the impact outside of the direct study area. It should therefore be considered that the traffic congestion that is outlined in the impact assessment is acceptable with regard to the urban location of the area in the context of the increased movement of people overall and on sustainable modes in particular.
- 6.4.4. As outlined within Chapter 6 of the EIAR and summarised in Table 6-59, 'Summary of Potential Operational Phase Impacts', the Proposed Scheme will deliver strong positive impacts to the quality of pedestrian, cycling and bus infrastructure during the Operational Phase providing for enhanced levels of People Movement in line with the scheme objectives. These improvements will help to provide an attractive alternative to the private car and promote a modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport, allowing for greater capacity and comfort along the corridor to facilitate the sustainable movement of people as population and employment levels grow in the future.
- 6.4.5. According to the National Planning Framework, 2018, the population of the Greater Dublin Area is forecast to increase by 25% by 2040 and this growth will have associated travel demands, placing added pressure on the transport system. The EIAR compares the effects of do-nothing, do-minimum and do-something scenarios in future years. The do-nothing scenario represents the current traffic and transport conditions without the proposed scheme and other GDA Strategy projects in place. The do-minimum scenario for opening year (2028) and design year (2043) represents the likely conditions without the proposed scheme in place but allowing

for all other GDA Strategy schemes to be implemented (other BusConnects elements, Dart+, Luas green line capacity enhancement, GDA Cycle Network Plan for 2028, and for 2043 assumes full implementation of GDA Strategy including MetroLink, Dart+ Tunnel, and Luas extensions to Lucan, Finglas and Bray). Finally, the do-something scenario represents the conditions with everything in place.

- 6.4.6. A people movement assessment was undertaken for the EIAR using outputs from the NTA Eastern Regional Model (ERM) and Local Area Model (LAM) and comparing the 'do minimum' and 'do something' peak hours for 2028 and 2043. Population growth has been derived by linear interpolation between 2016 Census data and the NPF 2040 population growth forecast. It is envisaged that the population will grow by 11% up to 2028 and by 25% by 2043. Employment growth is also forecasted to grow by 22% by 2028 and 49% by 2043, with an assumed growth in goods vehicle of 45% and 77% respectively up to the same years. I consider the use of 2016 Census data to be acceptable given the lead in time to the project and extensive analysis carried out. In consideration of this matter, I have also reviewed the October 2023 Central Statistics Office transport bulletin which shows that the number of bus journeys in Dublin have returned to (and more frequently exceed) the levels in 2019 (the last full year of pre-pandemic travel). Furthermore, I consider that with the population and economic growth anticipated, projected, and targeted over the short, medium, and long term, it is correct for the survey details to consider pre-pandemic levels of traffic and that levels of demand will increase in line with growth.
- 6.4.7. The NTA submit that from the information provided that the applicant has carried out a robust and detailed modelling of the entire route. This is demonstrated in the traffic modelling undertaken, the results of which are presented in Chapter 6 of the EIAR. It is noted that this modelling includes the movement of buses to and through the city centre. I also refer to the NTA's detailed response to this matter set out in section 4.9

of this report above. The NTA notes that the approach adopted in assessing and presenting the information is in line with TII's Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines (May 2014). This document is considered best practice guidance for the assessment of transport impacts, related to changes to traffic flow, due to proposed developments and is an appropriate means of assessing the impact of general traffic trip redistribution on the surrounding road network.

6.4.8. The modelling carried out shows a consistent increase in the travel demands associated with both a growing population and economy, and highlights the significant improvements throughout in the 'do something' scenario when compared to the 'do minimum'. Positive impacts are predicted in relation to pedestrian, cycling and bus infrastructure. Very significant positive and long-term impacts are predicted from the modelling in terms of bus network performance (journey times and bus reliability). It is noted that the modelled forecasts for the 2028 opening year indicate:

- A significant decrease in people travelling to/from the city by car in each peak period with decreases of 50% and 35% in the AM and PM peak periods respectively.
- A significant increase in people travelling by public transport in each peak period with increases of 80% and 79% in the AM and PM peak periods respectively.
- An increase in people walking/cycling in each peak period with increases of 8% and 34% in the AM and PM peak periods respectively.

6.4.9. The scheme will facilitate a step change in the level of segregated cycling provision in comparison with existing conditions along the entire length of the corridor. It is submitted that the transport modelling is conservative in terms of the predicted cycling mode share. The scheme has been designed to cater for much higher levels of cycling uptake than modelled outputs, to cater for long-term trends in travel

behaviours as people make sustainable travel lifestyle choices, which would otherwise not be achievable in the absence of the proposed scheme.

- 6.4.10. A micro-simulation model assessment has been developed and network performance indicators established for bus operations along the route. As previously highlighted, the results of the assessment demonstrate that the Proposed Scheme will deliver average inbound journey time savings for F1 service bus passengers of c7.4 minutes (32%) in 2028 and c5.4 minutes (26%) in 2043. An average outbound journey time savings for F1 service bus passengers of up to c. 2.8 minutes (16%) in 2028 (PM) and c. 1.8 minutes (11%) in 2043 (PM). Based on the AM and PM peak hours alone, 7.4 hours of savings in 2028 and 6.2 hours in 2043, when compared to the Do Minimum combined across all buses. Based on the AM and PM peak hours alone, this equates to c. 6.3 hours of savings in 2028 and 4.8 hours in 2043 combined across all buses when compared to the Do Minimum. On an annual basis this equates to approximately 4,700 hours of bus vehicle savings in 2028 and 3,600 hours in 2043, when considering weekday peak periods only.
- 6.4.11. Overall, it is anticipated that the improvements to the network performance indicators for bus users along the route will have a Positive, Very Significant and Long-term effect. These are significant improvements that will reduce the amount of congestion along this existing transport corridor and provide a mechanism whereby the predicted population and economic growth for Dublin can be sustainably managed in terms of traffic and transport demands.
- 6.4.12. I consider the modelling carried out is robust, based on accurate data and reaches reasonable conclusions. I am therefore satisfied that the applicants have utilised a detailed, robust and multi-faceted modelling approach to develop the proposed scheme.

## **6.5. Adequacy of Consultation**

- 6.5.1. I note that a number of concerns are raised within the third-party submissions received in relation to the adequacy, type and frequency of consultation carried out. I also note some observers consider that the consultation carried out was acceptable. Concerns are raised in relation to the timing of the consultation given that it occurred during the COVID pandemic and associated lock downs. There are concerns that the public were not made fully aware of the details of the proposed scheme and were prohibited from engaging with the NTA in relation to the design process. Further concerns are raised in relation to the virtual format utilised by the NTA to undertake consultations as a result of the pandemic and some believe that many people were unable to access the online forum and therefore did not have an opportunity to consider or make representations to the scheme.
- 6.5.2. Reference is also made within a number of submissions to compliance with the Aarhus convention and the Kazakhstan Advice.
- 6.5.3. I refer the Board to the NTA's response to concerns raised in relation to the consultation process above and consider it important to reiterate at this juncture the key points that have been made. It is stated by the applicant that three rounds of consultation were undertaken with a number of methods used including, a dedicated website, brochures social media coverage, advertising and public information events, whereby the first 2 sessions were held in person and the 3<sup>rd</sup> virtually due to COVID restrictions. Details of the public meeting events are outlined within the NTA's response summarised above within the third-party section of my report. I refer the Board to this section for details of same. I note that the overall total public consultation period for the Proposed Scheme amounted to 4 months.

- 6.5.4. In relation to the statutory process, I note the applicant erected site notices along the proposed route, advertised the scheme within the relevant newspapers as required and engaged with third parties who have engaged with the process through their submissions to the Board.
- 6.5.5. I note the submission from Peter Drennan, 73 Poddle Park in relation to failed consultation procedure. Specifically, the issue was raised in relation to the proposed closure of Poddle Park to general traffic at the southern end and that residents of Poddle Park did not receive a letter as 'impacted properties'. The NTA response submits that notice letters were issued to the owners or occupiers of properties from which land was potentially proposed to be acquired in the Compulsory Purchase Order for the Proposed Scheme, as these properties would be directly affected. For other properties from which land would not be acquired, the owners were not sent notice letters as this could apply to all properties in a very wide urban area. Instead, the comprehensive public consultation process provided reasonable notice to the general public of the proposals which could affect them indirectly.
- 6.5.6. I highlight that non-statutory site notices were erected at the location of each of the proposed restrictions of the public right-of-way, which included the junction at the southern end of Poddle Park with Ravensdale Park. These notices provided a further opportunity for the residents in the immediate vicinity to become aware of the specific proposals at that location. I agree with the applicant that the receipt of the relevant submission is evidence that the site notice at Poddle Park was successful in alerting the local residents to the proposals at that location.
- 6.5.7. Site Notices No.1 at Poddle Park and at No.2 Derravaragh Road that were initially installed on 27th of July 2023 contained incorrect maps. These errors were rectified with new Site Notices erected on 26th October 2023. The statutory public

consultation period was extended to 8th of December to allow a full 7 weeks' period after the notices had been corrected.

- 6.5.8. Overall, I am satisfied that the applicant has complied with the requirements of the Aarhus Convention in its relevance to the statutory process and note that such requirements are not relative to any non-statutory consultation which is carried out at the discretion of the applicant.
- 6.5.9. It is of further note that the Kazakhstan Advice is also not relevant to any non-statutory public consultation and relates to the holding of public hearings in relation to the statutory process. Such hearings provided for under the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended are a discretionary function of the Board.
- 6.5.10. It is also clear that the residents and the wider community along the route have been made fully aware of the scheme details and as a result have participated actively in the application process through some 116 submissions received by the Board which is welcomed.
- 6.5.11. Concerns have also been raised in relation to the level of clarity provided within the documents in relation to the description of the proposed works. I have reviewed the documentation, plans and particulars submitted with the application in detail and note that the documents provided leave no ambiguity to the specifics of the proposed scheme extents in terms of its route, design, implementation and all mitigation measures proposed.
- 6.5.12. Thus, having regard to the documentation submitted in terms of public notices, advertisement and details of non-statutory consultations and engagement with third parties, I am satisfied that the applicant has clearly engaged with the community and all third parties and has amended the scheme accordingly where it has been feasible to do so in response to the concerns raised.

## **6.6. Route Selection / Alternatives Considered**

- 6.6.1. The consideration of alternatives is documented within Section 3 of the EIAR submitted. I note that alternatives were considered at three levels, strategic alternatives, route alternatives and design alternatives.
- 6.6.2. The strategic alternatives considered are Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), light rail, metro, heavy rail, demand management and technological alternatives. As referred to above, in the preceding section of this report, the appropriate type of public transport provision in any particular case is predominately determined by the likely quantum of passenger demand along the particular public transport route. With this in mind the applicant considered the option of constructing a light rail service which would cater for a passenger demand of between 3,500 and 7,000 per hour per direction (inbound and outbound journeys). Based on the number of passengers predicted to use the new service, it was considered that there would be insufficient demand to justify a light rail option. The light rail option would also require significantly more land take, necessitating the demolition of properties.
- 6.6.3. Metro alternative was also considered and as there is a higher capacity requirement for such solutions it was not suitable for this route. In addition, the development of an underground metro would not remove the need for additional infrastructure to serve the residual bus needs of the area covered by the Proposed Scheme. Heavy rail alternatives carry in excess of 10,000 people each direction each hour and was considered an unsuitable solution.
- 6.6.4. Demand management in the form of restricting car movement or car access through regulatory signage and access prohibitions, to parking restrictions and fiscal measures (such as tolls, road pricing, congestion charging, fuel/vehicle surcharges and similar) were all considered as alternatives to the proposed scheme. However, it



is stated that in the case of Dublin, the existing public transport system does not currently have sufficient capacity to cater for large volumes of additional users, such measures would not work in isolation to address car journeys into and out of the city and would not encourage people onto alternative modes.

- 6.6.5. Whilst technological alternatives are becoming increasingly advanced, the use of electric vehicles does not address congestion problems and the need for mass transit. The reasonable conclusion is reached that enhanced bus priority and cycle facilities, together with a rail upgrade involving limited construction works are best placed to serve the corridor having regard to economic and environmental factors and passenger numbers that each mode would carry.
- 6.6.6. The route selection stage examined the road network along the corridor using a “spiders web” approach to select the most desirable roads for the corridor. Design alternatives were examined during the different phases of public consultation where certain details, such as space constraints, lack of appropriate adjacent linkages to form a coherent end-to-end route, unsuitability of particular routes, the need for significant land take from residential properties and related construction GHG impacts.
- 6.6.7. Following confirmation of the PRO, the scheme design was developed further in more detail, during which a number of refinements were made, as described, in the EIAR, from south to north:
1. At the southern end of Kimmage Road Lower, it had been proposed to provide a cycle track through Poddle Park towards the River Poddle Cycleway route. However, to reduce impact on this small public park, cycle tracks will instead be provided on the public roads outside of the park, which removed all impacts for the park.

2. At Sundrive Cross, the junction will be modified to provide protected cycle tracks with an east-west cycle route from Larkfield Avenue to Sundrive Road as part of the future planned orbital cycle route to provide additional safety for cyclists.
3. To avoid operational impacts in the church grounds, the proposed Poddle Way cycle route will no longer cross Mount Argus Park and the grounds of Mount Argus Church, and instead it will re-join Kimmage Road Lower at Mount Argus View.
4. The proposed Bus Gate at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park will only operate in the morning peak period from 6am to 10am in the northbound direction, which will facilitate traffic to exit from Mount Argus Cemetery after funerals, thereby minimising impacts on this importance community facility.
5. Following consideration of several possible locations, proposals for a 22 space public car park at Our Lady's Hospice were confirmed, with the location selected at the front of the site nearest Harold's Cross Road. This location has the least impact for the future development and operation of the hospice, while compensating for the loss of some existing public parking on the street nearby.
6. The junction of Mount Drummond Avenue on Harold's Cross Road will be narrowed with additional street trees and four more parking spaces provided, which will benefit pedestrian safety and comfort when crossing the side street, improve the street landscape, and provide a little more parking for the local community which is in short supply.
7. Access for Gordon's Fuels at the Grand Canal on Clanbrassil Street Upper was modified to provide a shared laneway from the north beside the Mullen Scrap premises, instead of a new ramp beside the canal, which would have encroached into the premises to a much greater degree and reduce the operational yard area for the business, and potential for future development; and

8. The layout of the junction at Leonard's Corner was revised to provide upstream bus priority signals on South Circular Road for the orbital bus route. This enables provision of protected cycle tracks on all four approaches and at the corners of the junction.

- 6.6.8. I note that a number of submissions are concerned of the proposed cycle route from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Estate. It is submitted it is impactable, and cyclists will not divert to a longer, slower winding route. Other concerns relate to changes to the direction and length of the segregated cycle track 'The Poddle Cycleway'. Concerns are raised to specific roads impacted by diverted traffic, right hand turn bans, potential for indirect physical impact to individual properties or other elements of the scheme. While Kenilworth Park Residents' Association welcome the scheme, they are concerned of removal of proposal for No Left Turn from Sundrive Road to Lower Kimmage Road. This, it is contended, will have a fundamental knock-on effect to the number of vehicles using LKR and to prevent through traffic from using Kenilworth Park instead of Clareville Road. It is submitted that no sufficient reason is given for deviation / change from initial proposals which provided for no left turn except buses taxis and bicycles.
- 6.6.9. Concern is raised with respect to proposal to place bollards at Derravaragh / Corrib Road. The view is expressed that the bollards at Aideen Road should be removed to facilitate local access given they will no longer be required. Concern is expressed that the Bus Gate at Kenilworth Square North will divert westbound traffic onto Rathgar Avenue. Concern of impact upon Stannaway Road. Objection submitted to 3 bus gates, which it is contended will displace traffic onto other roads south of KCR. It is contended that the Bus Gate at Ravensdale will give rise to increased traffic and congestion on Fortfield Road, TRW and Wainsfort Road. Concern of congestion and diverted traffic in particular HGV's. I note the Recorder Residents Association

submission raising concerns of failure to consider cumulative impact and alternative options. Their submission is summarised under no. 64 of Appendix 1 of this report. I have had regard and am mindful of the issues raised.

6.6.10. I believe that the concern that the preferred route has not been robustly considered is not substantiated. In the context of the information provided by the applicant I am satisfied that the applicant has carried out an extensive, detailed and robust assessment of all reasonable options for the proposed scheme. I draw the Board's attention to Chapter 3 of the EIAR in which the applicant comprehensively details all alternatives considered and the detailed assessment and consideration of alternative routes and the emergence of the preferred route.

6.6.11. In addition to the above, I note, there are many submissions in support of and welcome the design interventions. I highlight, in particular, the submission by Dublin City Council which is supportive of the proposal and recognises the significant improvements in terms of safe cycling measures and in enabling an efficient public transportation service along the route. Dublin City Council notes that DCC centralised traffic control system has for a number of years been linked to the bus automatic vehicle location system via a bespoke software called DPTIM and this link provides details of the bus location, its journey pattern and if the bus is ahead or behind schedule. It is submitted that for the BusConnects project, this system is being upgraded to link to the next Generation Automatic vehicle location system which will allow finer grain information to be transmitted to the DCC system for dynamic management of the corridor. I note that DCC have carried out modelling work to mimic the real-life operation of the project. It is stated that the design of this scheme is difficult and complex and has called for multiple interventions along the road network in order to achieve its objectives. The use of bus priority signals, bus gates and a combination of one-way systems and turn bans are all intended to alter

the current traffic situation along the route and ensure that public transport, walking and cycling can be prioritised over the private car. DCC recommends that the corridor needs to be considered as a whole and that the various different measures to prioritise public transport walking and cycling, need to be implemented in as full a manner as possible to avoid "watering down" the benefits of this scheme by making localised changes to the design.

- 6.6.12. It is my opinion that in the future it will be within the remit of DCC to review various alternative solutions as suggested by residents and numerous submissions with respect to turn bans, bollards, build outs, signage, enforcement etc. It is noted that the proposed scheme would not preclude such measures or amendments from being introduced at a later date, if deemed appropriate.
- 6.6.13. I highlight that Dublin Cycling Campaign welcomes the scheme. In particular, cycling facilities along the main CBC corridor, bus gates operational at peak times from KCR to Harolds Cross, provision of new canal bridges at Emmet Bridge, new bus stop by-passes along sections of Kimmage Road Lower, Harolds Cross Road and Clanbrassil Street, provision of segregated cycle tracks on Harolds Cross Road, addition of quiet way along the Poddle and through Mount Argus, removal of cycleway through Ravensdale Park, filtered permeability, improved pedestrian and cycle facilities at the KCR junction and the removal of slip roads. Cllr Pat Dunne & Joan Collins TD and Others also welcomes the project and submit that creation of permeability from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus by removing part of a wall at the stone boat feature is welcomed. A large number of the submission welcome the scheme overall and agree that car use needs to be reduced. The submission by Hugh Raftery, 79 Corrib Road supports the project, see submission no. 34 in Appendix 1 of this report. It is submitted that half measures will limit the potential for success.

- 6.6.14. Section 3, of this report, above, has set out a detailed description of the overall project, including an overview of junction, bus stop, signage, infrastructure, and overall route design by section. A summary of the proposed changes as a result of the proposed scheme is set out in Table 4.1 section 4.2 chapter 4 'Proposed Scheme Description' of the EIAR. The proposed scheme provides for junction upgrades and associated ancillary works. Several submissions have been lodged in relation to specific infrastructure design elements within the scheme (as set out above).
- 6.6.15. No other infrastructure projects are planned within the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme which will interface with the proposals. As part of the Preliminary Design of the Proposed Scheme, consideration has been given to the potential coordination required in relation to other schemes within the BusConnects CBC Infrastructure Works. The section outlines potential interactions of the Proposed Scheme with adjacent scheme(s) and identifies any procedures within the construction strategies that may be required in order to account for various sequencing scenarios in the construction of the schemes. The closest such scheme to the Proposed Scheme is the Templeogue / Rathfarnham to City Centre CBC Scheme, with which the Proposed Scheme interacts at the signalised junction of Harold's Cross Road / Rathgar Avenue / Kenilworth Square / Kenilworth Park and the junction of Harold's Cross Road and Parkview Avenue.
- 6.6.16. The Proposed Scheme will also interact with the Tallaght / Clondalkin to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme at its terminal point at the junction of Kevin Street and Patrick Street. The BusConnects Infrastructure team has coordinated the design tie-ins at these locations to ensure a holistic design has been achieved, so that each scheme can be implemented, and integrated, regardless of the sequencing of their construction.

6.6.17. The Preferred Route Options (PRO) Report explains the rationale for the Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme. Chapter 6 of the PRO report presented an appraisal of all route options considered for Kimmage CBC Corridor 11. I highlight that provision of bus priority will result in some impact for general traffic flow along the corridor where bus priority cannot be achieved through provision of bus lanes and bus gates are necessary as an alternative. On the narrow street of Kimmage Road Lower approaching Harold's Cross, the NTA submit that it would not be feasible to widen the road into very small front gardens sufficiently for the addition of bus lanes. Instead, a bus gate will divert through traffic off this route and thereby provide bus priority. Local access will generally be maintained along the Proposed Scheme corridor although there could be some impacts on local traffic where it is required to follow diversion routes around bus gates. At some locations it may be necessary to adopt turning movement restrictions or local road closures for appropriate traffic management. Reductions in traffic carrying capacity of the road network will be compensated for by the overall increase in quality and level of service of other modes (walking, cycling and public transport) on the Proposed Scheme route once implemented.

6.6.18. The following list highlights the main changes between the published EPR Option and the PRO:

- A southern bus gate is proposed on Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with Ravensdale Park instead of at Sundrive Cross further north.
- The existing road layout is retained along Kimmage Road Lower north of the junction with Ravensdale Park which will become a quiet street with the diversion of through traffic to other routes.
- An additional alternative Poddle Cycleway is included along quiet streets to the west of Kimmage Road Lower. This will include a new shared pedestrian and

cycle link at the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk overhanging the River Poddle between Sundrive Road and Mount Argus.

- Public realm enhancement is proposed with a new median island in the centre of Kimmage Road Lower on either side of the Corrib Road junction with new street trees.
- Public realm enhancements are proposed at Sundrive Cross with new street trees and an on-street parking bay on the eastern side of Kimmage Road Lower south of Sundrive Cross.
- The junction of Harold's Cross Road and Kenilworth Park will be modified to provide for the southbound right-turn as an alternative route to Kimmage instead of the direct route from Harold's Cross Park where there will be a bus gate.
- Cycle tracks are proposed along Harold's Cross Road through some localised road widening into adjoining properties where necessary to provide the required width. A short parking layby will be provided on the eastern side of Harold's Cross Road.
- A new public car park will be provided at the front of Our Lady's Hospice to replace on-street parking spaces that will be removed nearby.
- New trees will be planted on Harold's Cross Road at the junction with Mount Drummond Avenue, with some additional parking spaces.
- At Robert Emmett Bridge over the Grand Canal, new footbridges will be provided on both sides of the existing concrete arch bridge to allow the road space on the existing bridge to be allocated to bus lanes in both directions.



- Signal-controlled priority will be provided for buses in the north-south and east-west directions through the Leonard's Corner junction between Clanbrassil Street and South Circular Road.
- Cycle tracks will be provided along Clanbrassil Street and New Street South instead of the alternative route on quiet streets through Portobello to the east.
- Almost all existing street trees in the median along Clanbrassil Street and New Street South will be retained.

6.6.19. I consider that the justification for the chosen route is well documented, clear, reasoned and rational. It is my opinion the chosen route is well considered and reasonable on the basis of the information set out above, the feasibility and options report, and Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) which evaluated the route options under the assessment criteria of economy, integration, accessibility and social inclusion, safety and environment. In particular, with respect to environment, the chosen route has regard to archaeology, architectural and cultural heritage, hydrology, potential to impact on the townscape / streetscape as well as the landscape and visual impact, air quality, noise and vibration. From my assessment of the information on file I conclude that the chosen route has benefits over other options in relation to Capital Cost, Transport Quality and Reliability, Cycle Network Integration, Key Trip Attractors, Road Safety, Pedestrians Safety, Flora and Fauna and Landscape and Visual.

6.6.20. Based on the analysis submitted I am of the opinion that the Core Bus Corridor Infrastructure Works achieves the project objectives in supporting the delivery of an efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service, which supports the achievement of Ireland's emission reduction targets. The Core Bus Corridor Infrastructure Works has the potential to reduce GHG emissions equivalent to the removal of approximately 105,500 and 209,100 car trips per weekday from the road

network in 2028 and 2043 respectively. This has the effect of a reduction in total vehicle kilometres, a reduction in fuel usage, and increases to sustainable transport trips and modal share in accordance with the 2024 Climate Action Plan. It is concluded that, cumulatively, the Core Bus Corridor Infrastructure Works will make a significant contribution to carbon reduction.

- 6.6.21. I am satisfied based on the information submitted that the proposed route both in isolation and in combination with the other 11 Core Bus Corridor Schemes, will meet its required objectives (maximising people movement capacity across the city) and that the environmental impacts and level of residual impacts will be reduced to a minimum. I am also satisfied that the cumulative and in combination impacts have been robustly assessed in the documents submitted, that the route alternatives considered are robust and sufficient to reach reasonable and logical balanced conclusions.
- 6.6.22. Busconnects is the most likely new public transport plan to be achieved this decade. This plan will improve travel times, air quality and safety right across the proposed scheme catchment and the entire city. It will provide a faster and more efficient bus service for everyone in addition to delivering improved cycling and pedestrian facilities.

## **6.7. Project/Junction Design**

- 6.7.1. A summary of the overall junction design approach adopted has been set out in section 3.1 previously above, in general the approach is to limit left turning filter lanes and provide segregated, delineated, and controlled crossings for cyclists and pedestrians. I note the proposed scheme provides for the provision of 12 junction upgrades and the provision of 29 new/refurbished raised table side entry facilities.

- 6.7.2. Some submissions welcome and support the public realm improvements at junctions such as at the junction of Sundrive Road with Lower Kimmage Road and at junction of Ravensdale Park with Lower Kimmage Road. Dublin Cycling Campaign welcome improved pedestrian and cycle facilities at the KCR junction and the removal of slip roads. I note concern of the Bus Gate at the junction of Kimmage Road Lower and Ravensdale Road with no left turn between the hours of 6pm and 8pm. It is submitted that at the revised Mount Drummond Junction an alternative car parking arrangement should be considered in the redesign. Parallel parking is preferred to perpendicular parking for safety reasons. It is submitted that parking should also be located further away from the junction. Concern is raised of set of bollards at junction of Derravaragh and Corrib Roads which it is submitted will block easy access to Terenure village. It is contended that if bollards are permitted, they should comprise planter boxes and this should be repeated at the Derravaragh / Aideen junction. I tend to agree with this observation and I will deal with this separately, further, in this report. Concern is raised that sufficient segregation for cyclists is not provided at junctions and that junctions are not in compliance with DMURS.
- 6.7.3. The Proposed Scheme has been designed over the course of a number of years, and during this period the design principles have evolved to improve the movements of people through the junctions for all modes. The final design principles which guided the junction design are documented in the BusConnects Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet [BCODG] document. The design guidance document sets out four typical junction arrangements that could be adopted to achieve bus priority - referred to in order of preference as Junction Types 1-4. Only Junction Type 1 is proposed in the Proposed Scheme. I note that the junctions proposed within the scheme provide protection for pedestrians and cyclists and have been informed by international best practice. No two junctions are the same.

- 6.7.4. The key factor in the choice of junction type is the proportion of left-turning traffic that would conflict with both bus and cyclist movements. Junction Type 1 is described as follows:

Junction Type 1, described at BCPDG Section 7.4.1 comprises a dedicated bus lane on both inbound and outbound direction continues up to the junction stop line. Due to space constraints, general traffic travelling both straight ahead and turning left is restricted to one lane. Junction Type 1 is typically chosen for the following reasons:

- Volume of left turning vehicles greater than 100 PCUs per hour; and
- Urban setting, no space available for dedicated left turning lane / pocket.

In this instance, mainline cyclists proceed with the bus phase while general traffic is held. The bus lane gets red, allowing the general traffic lane to proceed. If the volume of left-turning vehicles is greater than 150 PCUs (passenger car units), then the cyclists should also be held on red. If the volume of left turners is approx. 100 – 150 PCUs, left turners will be controlled by a flashing amber arrow and cyclists can proceed with general traffic, while also receiving an early start.

- 6.7.5. The junction designs throughout the Proposed Scheme have been informed by the Design Manual for Urban Roads (DMURS), in particular with regard to the hierarchy of users (with pedestrians being afforded the highest priority, then cyclists then public transport with private vehicles at the bottom of the user hierarchy) and the requirements of providing safe crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists while facilitating traffic movements. All junctions provide for protected cyclist loitering areas and generally provide for delineated segregated crossing points dedicated to cyclists with separate pedestrian crossing points generally in place. In some instances, toucan crossings are provided (where carriageway crossing facilities are shared between pedestrians and cyclists). Toucan crossings are proposed to facilitate mid-

stream crossings (between junctions) and to accommodate crossings where a junction cannot accommodate separate dedicated cyclist and pedestrian crossing infrastructure. I note the inclusion of toucan crossings to be provided across R817 Kimmage Road Lower, to the north of Hazelbrook Road and to the south of Mount Argus View. Also, the existing signalised pedestrian crossings across R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower & Clanbrassil Street Upper are to be upgraded to Toucan crossings. I am satisfied that the use of toucan crossings at the select locations indicated is appropriate, relevant and all suitable measures have been included to ensure safety of users.

- 6.7.6. Overall, toucan crossings within the scheme are only specified at certain specific locations where alternative crossing arrangements are either not suitable or appropriate. I consider that the level of service being provided to pedestrians and cyclists using these crossings constitutes an improvement from the existing situations in place along the route and that all measures and crossings represent a safe and sustainable means of crossing roads for all.
- 6.7.7. The proposed junction designs incorporated throughout the Proposed Scheme generally provide for deflection of the cycle track at junctions to provide a protection kerb/buffer between cyclists and vehicular traffic. The radius and design of the kerbing requires vehicles to carry out a tighter turning manoeuvre to complete a left turn which effectively will force them to slow down prior to and during the turn. This junction arrangement is provided both at the larger signalised controlled junctions as well as on smaller (non-signalised) side junctions where an additional raised table treatment is incorporated to further reduce traffic speeds and highlight the potential presence of pedestrians and cyclists to left turning vehicles. At signalised junctions the design layout also keeps straight-ahead and right-turning cyclists on the raised-adjacent cycle track as far as the junction, avoiding any cyclist-vehicle conflict which

may arise from cyclists weaving and merging lanes on the approach to junctions. The design of the protection kerbing incorporated at junctions also restricts cyclists from crossing over to the centre of a junction to turn right and thus they will be directed to cross via the designated crossing points thus improving their safety at such locations.

- 6.7.8. Signalling is also used to improve safety where possible, so that staggered signalling will be used to highlight and assert the presence of cyclists where left turning vehicles may proceed at the same time (this is particularly important in situations where left turning traffic will be coming from a more central lane and crossing a bus lane). The Board should also note that the Proposed Scheme incorporates new signalling which will highlight the necessity for left turning vehicles to proceed with caution, be aware of, and yield to, cyclists and pedestrians proceeding straight.
- 6.7.9. In relation to project design and junction design I note that Section 6 of the EIAR examines the impact of the proposed scheme on traffic. Paragraph 9.223 of the EIA section of this report sets out the assessment for Roads and Traffic. Therefore, this planning assessment should be read in conjunction with the EIA.
- 6.7.10. In relation to pedestrian crossings I am satisfied that the proposal has been designed to ensure pedestrian safety at all junctions. The number of pedestrian signal crossings (incl. at junctions) will increase from 35 to 47 and all are designed in an appropriate and safe manner with two-stage crossings generally provided where crossing distances will be in excess of 19m. Additionally, there will be an increase in the number of raised table crossings on side roads. It will provide 1.75 km inbound and 1.75 km outbound of segregated cycle facilities, excluding quiet street treatment. The proportion of segregated cycle facilities (incl. quiet street) will increase from 3.2Km on the existing corridor to 4Km on the proposed scheme. The proportion of the route having bus priority measures will increase from 18% on the existing corridor to 100% on the Proposed Scheme.

6.7.11. I note the following Major Signalised Junctions along the scheme:

- Kimmage Cross Roads
- Ravensdale Park / Kimmage Road Lower
- Sundrive Cross
- Mount Argus View / Kimmage Road Lower
- Parkview Avenue / Harold's Cross Road
- Harold's Cross Road
- Grand Canal / Harold's Cross Road
- Leonard's Corner (South Circular Road / Clanbrassil Street)
- St Patrick's Street / New Street South
- Kenilworth Square / Harold's Cross Road

6.7.12. I note concerns have been raised in relation to the design of a number of specific junctions, down to specific design features and extent of yellow boxes, and requests to separate out toucan crossing arrangements. On review of the junction design approaches and the evolution of the junction designs set out in the application documentation, I am satisfied that the design and arrangements provided at junctions are appropriate to ensure pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular safety while also working within the urban constraints present along the route to minimise impacts arising.

6.7.13. The majority of assessed junctions have V / C ratios of below 85% (i.e. they are operating well within capacity for all assessed years in both the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios). This indicates that these junctions will be able to accommodate any additional general traffic volumes redistributed as a result of the Proposed Scheme. The effect of the Proposed Scheme on the majority of junctions is

deemed Imperceptible to Not Significant and Long-Term. No junctions are predicted to experience a significance of effect that is significant or higher. It should be noted that while there are low impacts to the operational capacity in the indirect study area, this level of congestion is acceptable according to national guidance. Section 3.4.2 of DMURS (Government of Ireland 2019) recognises that a certain level of traffic congestion is an inevitable feature within urban networks and that junctions may have to operate at saturation levels for short periods of time during the peak hours of the day. Chapter 1 of the Smarter Travel Policy Document (DoT 2019c) also acknowledges that it is not feasible or sustainable to accommodate continued demand for car use. Therefore, I agree, that the traffic congestion that is outlined in the impact assessment is acceptable with regard to the urban location of the area.

## **6.8. Issues Raised**

### **6.9. Section 1 - Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Crossroads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road**

6.9.1. The Proposed Scheme along this section of the corridor, is described in detail in section 3.0 of this report above, Proposed Development. Some 61 of the 116 no. submissions raise issues relating to:

- 30 km/h speed limit
- Pedestrian facilities
- Cycling facilities
- Public realm improvements
- Stone Boat Boardwalk
- Parking



- Junctions
- Bus shelters
- Drainage

6.9.2. I highlight that the NTA acknowledges the comments raised in relation to camera enforcement and 30 Kph speed limit enforcement. Whilst speed limits and enforcement for the lawful use of bus lanes is currently a matter for An Garda Síochána, the NTA is separately exploring proposals and methods for bus lane enforcement as set out under Measure INT24 – Enforcement of Road Traffic Laws of the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022-2042. With the State having incurred the very large expenditure required to deliver the BusConnects Programme, it is vital to ensure that sufficient enforcement is in place such that the benefits of that investment are not eroded by widespread breaches of the restrictions applying to bus lanes, cycle tracks and junctions. To effectively ensure this outcome, it is acknowledged that camera-based enforcement will be required to augment the on-street activities of An Garda Síochána. This type of arrangement is in place in many jurisdictions internationally, where camera detection of certain breaches of regulations is linked to the automatic issue of fixed penalty notices. This is noted.

6.9.3. **Issues raised in respect of pedestrians include:**

- Additional pedestrian crossings requested on Kimmage Road Lower in vicinity of Aideen Avenue, and Kenilworth Park / Westfield Road.
- Pedestrian crossing on Kimmage Road Lower at McGowan's pub proposed under separate planning permission for new local schools.
- Objections to proposals to widen road and remove footpath at southern end of Harold's Cross Park. On route to bus stops when park is closed in the evening. Need for raised platforms across the junction at the western end and

the wide crossing of side street at Shamrock Villas on southern side of the road.

- Request for safe pedestrian crossing at Kenilworth Park down Wilfrid Road on walking route towards schools in Harold's Cross

6.9.4. With regard to ensuring pedestrian priority, additional physical interventions along the proposed scheme, such as enhanced/additional pedestrian crossings, raised table side entry treatments, and enhanced cycling infrastructure, have been assessed in the EIAR (Volume 4 Appendices Part 1 of 2, Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendices) Appendix 4 and summarised in Section 8 of the Traffic Impact Assessment Report and Section 6.4.6.1.7 of the Volume 2 - Main Chapters Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport. These interventions, further enhance the movement hierarchy emphasis in line with the Proposed Scheme Objectives. It is noted that the additional pedestrian crossing on Kimmage Road Lower in the vicinity of Aideen Avenue, and Kenilworth Park/Westfield Road are both in low speed, low flow context within bus gates. Therefore, it is submitted that there is no need for additional controlled pedestrian crossings as it will become much easier to cross Kimmage Road Lower when the general traffic volume will be much reduced.

6.9.5. It is submitted in the NTA response that a new pedestrian crossing on Kimmage Road Lower at McGowan's pub is proposed under separate planning permission for new local schools, is noted. With the large reduction in traffic that will arise due to the bus gate at this location, the need for a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing will be removed.

6.9.6. With respect to objections to proposals to widen road and remove footpath at southern end of Harold's Cross Park. It is submitted that this is on the route to bus stops when the park is closed in the evening. There is a need for raised platforms across the junction at the western end and the wide crossing of the side street at

Shamrock Villas on southern side of the road. In the Proposed Scheme this short link street will be widened on the northern side to accommodate two-way traffic properly, alongside the retention of existing on-street parking for the houses on the southern side. The widening will require removal of the existing footpath along the northern side of the road adjacent to the park. The alternative option of removing the existing parking on the southern side of the street would adversely affect the amenity of the residents of the period houses, most of which do not have driveways for off-street parking, in a context where there is a general severe lack of alternative parking available in the area. This section of street carries a very small flow of traffic at present, but that will increase slightly due to the proposed bus gate on Kimmage Road Lower at the northern end of the park, which will divert local access traffic around the southern end of the park towards Mount Jerome Cemetery, Mount Argus Road, and homes opposite the western side of the park. The NTA accepts the suggestion that an improved pedestrian crossing could be provided at the junction at the western end of the link street where it joins Kimmage Road Lower, with a raised platform which would operate as a “courtesy crossing” as described in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS). This I consider can be carried out by way of condition in any grant of planning permission forthcoming.

- 6.9.7. I agree that the request for a safe pedestrian crossing at Kenilworth Park down Wilfrid Road on a walking route towards schools in Harold’s Cross can be addressed separately by Dublin City Council as it is not affected by the Proposed Scheme. Indeed, as I have stated earlier, in this report, the proposed scheme does not preclude alternative solutions or minor design changes as suggested by residents from being introduced or considered at a later date, if deemed appropriate.

**Issues Raised in respect of Cyclists include:**

- Parking prioritised over cycle lanes south of Sundrive Cross.

- Concern of safety of cycle route on Sundrive Road.
- Stone Boat Boardwalk and cycle route through residential estate. Objected to by 8 submissions, welcomed in 1 submission, with reservations and queries in 5 submissions. Security risk and anti-social behaviour / cycle route on narrow residential road with three sharp bends. Alternative cycle route through Eamonn Ceannt Park. Query about the benefits as no shorter than through Sundrive Cross. Concern of impact to Wildlife along River Poddle. Some people welcome the Boardwalk link if it is continued through Mount Argus.
- Harold's Cross Road south of the park needs improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.

6.9.8. With respect to the matter of parking prioritised over cycle lanes south of Sundrive Cross, the NTA submits that on the Kimmage Road Lower south of the Sundrive Cross there is a row of 22 houses on the eastern side of the road that do not have driveways. It is proposed to provide 16 spaces on that side of the road. This proposal will replace the existing part-time on-street parking. The advisory cycle lanes will be removed over this 150m long section of road. Cyclists will share the 3.0m wide traffic lane with a greatly reduced volume of traffic in a low speed 30km/h environment, which is consistent with the provisions of the Cycle Design Manual. An alternative cycle route is also proposed in parallel to Kimmage Road Lower, along Poddle Park, Bangor Road, and Blarney Park to Sundrive Road. This route along local residential streets will require no changes to the existing road layout north of the junction of Poddle Park and Ravensdale Park which will be closed to through traffic. The traffic restriction will greatly reduce the volume of traffic on the proposed cycle route. The busgates will greatly reduce general traffic on Kimmage Road Lower south of Harolds Cross Park and north of Ravendale / Poddle Park.

6.9.9. I note the Stone Boat Boardwalk and cycle route through Mount Argus estate was objected to by 8 submissions, welcomed in 1 submission, with reservations and queries in 5 submissions. Concerns of security risk and anti-social behaviour / cycle route on narrow residential road with three sharp bends. Aa alternative would be a cycle route through Eamonn Ceannt Park. Concern of the benefits as the route is no shorter than the route via Sundrive Cross. Concern of negative impact upon Wildlife along River Poddle. Some people welcome the Stone Boat link if it continued through Mount Argus. The NTA response notes that the proposed new pedestrian and cycle link from Mount Argus Way to Sundrive Road along the course of the River Poddle will provide a new and direct link for the community in Mount Argus to walk or cycle more quickly to the heart of Kimmage Village and the shopping centre. It will also shorten the distance from the residential community along Sundrive Road to Mount Argus Church. The existing walking distance from the junction of Mount Argus Way / Mount Argus Avenue to Kimmage Shopping Centre via Kimmage Road Lower is 400m. The more direct route along the Stone Boat Boardwalk will be 220m. For someone living in Mount Argus Square the distance will reduce from 500m to only 120m. Section 10.2.1 of the EIAR Chapter 10 Population, and Appendix A10.2 Chapter 10, assess the economic impact of the Core Bus Corridors, which includes consideration of the impact of transport infrastructure on criminal activity. The conclusion reached on page 25 of Appendix A10.2 is that 'the new infrastructure improvements should have a direct and immediate impact on crime along the corridors. It will provide better, safer and more visible bus stops whilst also improving the wider public realm infrastructure through investments such as improved street lighting. This will act as a direct deterrent to criminal activity and result in a reduction in crime. This in turn has been shown to encourage people onto the streets into the evening which will also support the night time economy in community centres'.

6.9.10. Section 10.4.4.1.1 of EIAR Chapter 10 Population considers the Community Amenity and for Mount Argus community area this is assessed a Positive, Not Significant and Long-term amenity effect. Additional information in relation to the potential community impacts arising from crime and antisocial behaviour is set out in EIAR Chapter 10 Population Appendix A10.2 Economic Impact of the Core Bus Corridors, which notes the following:

- “Good infrastructure has also been shown to have a positive impact on levels of crime, particularly low-level crimes such as theft and vandalism. There is evidence from a wide range of studies that redesigned public realm, especially those which are better lit and more visible, see significant reductions in the level of crime”.

6.9.11. I wholly agree that the local residents in the Mount Argus estate will benefit from greatly increased permeability on this more convenient and direct access route to their local shops and services. I am of the opinion connectivity should be supported. More direct connectivity is desirable and sustainable for the community living further north along Mount Argus Road who already walk through the grounds of the church and the public park on their way to Kimmage Village. In the other direction, the community along Sundrive Road and the area to the south at Blarney Park, Tonguefield Road and Bangor Road, etc., will have a more direct and quiet walking route to the local park and church at Mount Argus. These benefits will ensure that the proposed new route will be busy with local residents walking back and forth, which will provide passive security for the people living alongside the proposed new link.

6.9.12. I highlight that the alignment of the proposed new walking and cycling route is straight, with clear visibility along the full route. There is overlooking of the northern end of the route from the residences at Mount Argus Square, and the southern part through the car park to Sundrive Road is only 40m long. Opening up of the through

link should actually increase security for the businesses adjoining the car park at the southern end of the route, and for the residents of Mount Argus Square, Mount Argus Close and Mount Argus Way by increasing passive surveillance due to the regular movement of people back and forth along the new route. In this context, I agree, there should be no concerns about security or of a risk of anti-social behaviour on the proposed new link.

6.9.13. The roads in the Mount Argus estate are well laid out with short straight sections and regular sharp bends and junctions to branch streets acting as traffic management measures to reduce traffic speeds through the estate. In this respect, the road network within the estate complies with the recommendations of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) for providing a safe environment for the residents and people walking and cycling in the area. Having cycled through the estate while carrying out a site visit, I can confirm it is quiet and an ideal route for cyclists of all abilities and ages to safely share the road with slow residential traffic.

6.9.14. Similarly, the Cycle Design Manual advocates the use of low-trafficked neighbourhoods as an “effective way of delivering a dense network of quiet streets in urban areas without the need for protected cycle infrastructure. These quiet streets can provide the basic level of a cycle network... to enable local cycling trips and provide connections to the surrounding cycle network. They can also form important parts of higher level routes in the cycle network e.g. a secondary route may traverse through a low traffic neighbourhood to provide a connection to cycle tracks on boundary roads”. This cycle route has been identified as a feeder route within the 2022 Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan based on the low traffic volumes and low traffic speeds through the estate.

6.9.15. I note the NTA’s submission that the proposed scheme will retain the advisory cycle lanes along Kimmage Road Lower north of the junction with Sundrive Road /

Larkfield Avenue. Some of the traffic diverted away from Kimmage Road Lower at the bus gate introduced at Ravensdale Park will come to the Sundrive Road junction with the potential to create a somewhat hostile environment particularly for young children and vulnerable cyclists. In the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan (Figure 2-5-1) the route along the Stone Boat and through Mount Argus is indicated as a feeder link from Sundrive Road to the secondary route along Kimmage Road Lower that in turn connects with the primary route at Harold's Cross Road. While the feeder cycle route through Mount Argus may not be shorter than the alternative route along the main roads through Sundrive Cross, it will allow cyclists to bypass that busy junction, and will be a quieter and more attractive route for cyclists of all ages and abilities.

- 6.9.16. In the proposed scheme segregated cycle tracks will be provided along a length of 200m along Sundrive Road between the junctions with Blarney Park and Kimmage Road Lower. The proposed cycle tracks will be separated from traffic by a raised kerb which will be lowered as necessary for traffic to cross for access to driveways and parking areas. The kerb segregation will enhance safety for cyclists in the cycle tracks.
- 6.9.17. I note the NTA's response to concerns raised with respect to north bound cyclists crossing Harold's Cross Road to enter the school on the east side of the road. The entrance to the new schools at the former Harold's Cross Greyhound track is located 100m north of the junction at Parkview Avenue where there is a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing. Northbound cyclists can cross Harold's Cross Road at that junction, and they can then dismount and walk the short distance to the school entrance. As there is no footpath on the western side of Harold's Cross Road opposite the school, it would not be possible to provide a signal-controlled crossing for northbound cyclists directly at the school entrance. The response is considered



acceptable. I note that while the proposed scheme does not improve access for cyclists to the school it does not alter the existing access arrangements.

6.9.18. Issues raised with respect to cyclists are noted. I am of the opinion they have been satisfactorily responded to by the applicant and I highlight that provision for cyclists is discussed and assessed in greater detail in section 6.21 of this report. It is acknowledged that the design of this scheme is complex. Considering the constraints at a number of locations, I am satisfied that conflicts raised have been considered, responded to satisfactorily and the design of the proposed scheme is appropriate. I note that the NTA has no objection to liaising further with DCC with respect to local public realm improvements and agreeing full details of design prior to commencement of development.

6.9.19. **Issues Raised in respect of Public Realm include:**

- Median island with trees on Kimmage Road Lower at Corrib Road is unnecessary.
- Request for planters instead of bollards at road closures.
- Support for public realm improvements / Comments on specific aspects of the proposals at Sundrive Cross. Concern for lack of public realm south of Sundrive Cross.
- Objections to proposals to widen the road and remove the footpath at southern end of Harold's Cross Park. Impact to the setting of the park. Negative impact to granite kerb stones.
- More public realm improvements requested in Harold's Cross Village.
- Street furniture requested.

- 6.9.20. The NTA submit that it is an objective of the Proposed Scheme to ensure that the public realm is carefully considered in the design and development of the transport infrastructure and seek to enhance key urban focal points where appropriate and feasible. Public realm improvements are proposed at the focal point near the southern end of Kimmage Road Lower where there is a cluster of shops at the Corrib Road junction. The existing road carriageway is 13m wide along this section. In the middle of the road a 2m wide median island will be provided on which 14 new street trees will be planted. The existing road at this location is wider than necessary, which will encourage higher traffic speeds. The proposed median island will have a traffic calming effect to assist with compliance with the proposed 30 km/h speed limit. The new trees will greatly enhance the street landscape with a significant greening effect in an area with few existing street trees.
- 6.9.21. The NTA recognises the potential to enhance the streetscape at both the new and existing traffic closures on residential streets where filtered permeability will be provided for cyclists. At Derravaragh Road / Neagh Road, the existing closure consists of a concrete footpath and bollards across the original road, without a gap for cyclists to pass through. In the proposed scheme the existing road closure will be enhanced with an oak tree planted in the centre, and a pair of cycle tracks provided through the barriers / bollards proposed. The proposed new road closure a short distance to the south at Corrib Road will be landscaped with 6 new street trees placed around the split bicycle gate.
- 6.9.22. It is my opinion that planters instead of bollards should be used at all three road closures, Derravaragh Road / Corrib Road (proposed) Derravaragh Road / Neagh Road / Aideen Drive (existing) and Mount Tannant Avenue / Aideen Road / Derravaragh Road (existing) and that the road be dishd appropriately to accommodate cycle through paths, in line with resident's requests. They will better enhance the

environment in terms of landscaping and urban realm. This matter can be dealt with by way of condition and compliance. I note general arrangement drawing No 13 includes bicycle gates at all three road closures.

- 6.9.23. The scope for public realm in Kimmage Village was explored through the various non-statutory public consultations. It is submitted by the NTA that early proposals considered the possibilities along the western side of Kimmage Road Lower where there is a row of shops and businesses extending southwards from the junction with Sundrive Road. However, this area is private property behind the 2m wide public footpath and any public realm works would require the agreement of the property owners which was not forthcoming. The final scheme proposals will provide a major improvement of the public realm generally in Kimmage Village within the extents of the public road areas over a length of 200m along Kimmage Road Lower in the north-south direction, and for 100m in the east-west direction from Larkfield Avenue along Sundrive Road to Kimmage Shopping Centre. I concur that the public realm proposals in Kimmage Village will make a major improvement in the amenity of the village for the local community.
- 6.9.24. The need for the proposed modifications to the street layout including widening the road and removal of the footpath at the southern end of Harold's Cross Park, as set out above, is as a result of a constrained carriageway width. The alternative option of removing the existing parking on the southern side of the street would adversely affect the amenity of the residents of the period houses, most of which do not have driveways for off-street parking, in a context where there is a general severe lack of alternative parking available in the area.
- 6.9.25. The boundary wall and railing at the southern end of Harold's Cross Park will not be affected by the proposed alterations, which will look similar to the existing arrangement along the eastern boundary. The granite kerb stones will be reused

along the base of the park boundary wall to provide a narrow edge strip that will prevent vehicles from touching the boundary wall and railing.

- 6.9.26. With respect to public realm improvements requested in Harold's Cross Village it is noted that Harold's Cross Village is outside of the extents of the Proposed Scheme which does not include Harold's Cross Road south of the park (apart from localised traffic layout modifications at the junction with Kenilworth Park). Dublin City Council may separately consider a public realm improvement scheme for Harold's Cross Village.
- 6.9.27. Generally, the footpaths along the extents of the Proposed Scheme are not wide enough to accommodate much street furniture other than essential signs and lamp posts. Where there is more space such as at Kimmage Village, the Proposed Scheme will provide new street furniture to an appropriate degree. Planters are proposed on the northwest corner of the junction at Sundrive Road which is a sunny spot with a generously wide footpath area. The existing layout at this location was recently modified by Dublin City Council to extend the footpath with the removal of a small parking area. NTA understands that this parking is of particular use for customers of Thom's Pharmacy a short distance to the north, which is why it was shown to be retained in the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.9.28. I highlight that 'Pedestrian Footpath Widths and Public Realm' and 'Visual Impact and Townscape' is discussed and assessed in further detail in sections 6.17 and 6.22 of this report below. Overall, it is anticipated that there will be Positive, Significant and Long-Term effect to the quality of the pedestrian infrastructure and public realm along Section 1, 2 and 3 of the Proposed Scheme during the Operational Phase, which aligns with the overarching aim to provide enhanced walking infrastructure on the corridor. This is despite the loss of a short section of footway along the southern side of Harold's Cross Park due to the already well used

alternatives. The proposed scheme will result in the provision of new / refurbished pedestrian facilities and footpaths. The widened footpaths and high quality hard and soft landscaping contribute towards a safer, more attractive environment for pedestrians. I am satisfied that the urban realm has been designed to an acceptable standard.

**6.9.29. Issues Raised with respect to the Stone Boat Boardwalk include:**

- The City Archaeologist requests revised design proposals for the Stone Boat Boardwalk to enhance the setting and interpretation of the monument.
- A number of submissions are concerned with loss of cultural heritage due to impact of the boardwalk upon the Stone Boat feature, built in 1245 AD.

6.9.30. The NTA set out that it is the intention of the Proposed Scheme to enhance public access to, and awareness of the Stone Boat feature in the River Poddle. The feature will be visible underneath / beside the proposed boardwalk that will provide a new link for pedestrians and cyclists between the Mount Argus estate and Sundrive Road. It is intended in the design of the boardwalk to ensure that the Stone Boat will be visible through the deck of the boardwalk. NTA submit that they share the aspiration of the City Archaeologist to maximise visibility of the Stone Boat, and this will be achieved through the selection of materials and the detailing of the structure.

6.9.31. I note the requests to revise the design for the Stone Boat Boardwalk. However, having carried out a site visit and reviewed the plans and photomontages submitted, the alternative design proposal put forward by the City Archaeologist and the response of the NTA, I am satisfied that the design proposal put forward is acceptable and indeed preferable as it is less intrusive on the wider area. It will provide visibility of the monument through the perforated bridge deck, and there will be information boards provided to assist with interpretation of the monument. This will enhance visibility and give greater recognition of its presence; it will also add

interest to the permeable link route. I note the NTA response that it is not proposed to modify the proposed design, but the NTA is open to liaising further with the City Archaeologist in developing the information to be displayed at the site. This I consider appropriate and beneficial.

**6.9.32. Issues Raised in respect of Parking include:**

- Concern of provision of parking on LKR south of Sundrive with removal of cycle lanes. Parking on west side of KRL at Sundrive is private and EIAR Chapter 6 is incorrect.
- Concern of car park at Sundrive Road and proposed cycle route link:
  - Interaction between cyclists and pedestrians on the Poddle Cycleway with car parking and interference with access to rear of properties.
  - Access for maintenance and repair of the property and advertising hoarding.
  - Future redevelopment impacts.
  - Concern of construction compound (K1) restrictions for access.
  - Loss of 8 public car spaces.

6.9.33. As discussed above under provision for cyclists, it is noted that on Kimmage Road Lower south of the Sundrive Cross there is a row of 22 houses on the eastern side of the road that do not have driveways. In the non-statutory consultations NTA was made aware of the difficulties for the residents on this part of Kimmage Road Lower who need to move their vehicles from place to place at various times of day to adhere to on-street parking restrictions. The NTA acknowledge that existing parking behind the public footpath on the opposite western side of the street was described as “permit Parking” in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transportation, which was

not correct, as that parking is on private landing areas and is not available to the general public. In the Proposed Scheme it is proposed to provide 16 new public full-time parking spaces on the eastern side of the road to accommodate the local residents in the centre of the village where public parking is in short supply. This proposal will replace the existing part-time on-street parking. The advisory cycle lanes will be removed over this 150m long section of road. Cyclists will share the 6m wide road with a much-reduced volume of traffic in a low-speed 30km/h environment, which is appropriate in accordance with the Cycle Design Manual.

- 6.9.34. Pedestrians and cyclists on the Poddle Way route via the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk will share the car park access aisle with vehicular movements to the car parking spaces and the access to the rear of the adjoining properties. The NTA submit that such vehicular movements are very occasional and there will be minimal interference caused by the mixing with pedestrians and cyclists in a safe and slow-moving situation. From my site visits I accept that this is a valid response and acceptable in terms of the overall scheme objectives and aims.
- 6.9.35. I agree that the proposed design will not interfere with the existing access for maintenance and repair of the adjoining properties and of the advertising hoarding on the eastern side. In this respect these activities can take place as normal with suitable public safety measures and precautions and will be no different to the situation at the front of the properties on the public footpath along Sundrive Road.
- 6.9.36. I also agree that if the adjoining sites were to be further developed, this could require access for construction and scaffolding from the adjoining car park area. Such arrangements would be subject to normal licencing by the local authority and would require provisions for public safety, including possible temporary restriction of some of the parking spaces. The same requirements pertain at present, and the Proposed Scheme will make no practical difference in this regard.

- 6.9.37. It is noted that when roads and streets are being upgraded, there will be some temporary disruption / alterations to on-street and off-street parking provision, and access to premises in certain locations. It is agreed that local arrangements will be made on a case-by-case basis to maintain continued access to homes and businesses affected by the works, at all times, where practicable. I note the NTA's assurance that details regarding temporary access provisions will be discussed with residents and business owners prior to construction starting in the area. The duration of the works will vary from property to property, but access and egress will be maintained at all times. This provision is set out in the CEMP which will be subject to condition and compliance in any grant of planning permission forthcoming. In addition, the appointed contractor will be required to put in place a Communications Plan in accordance with the NTA's requirements to inform the public (and affected properties) in advance of construction works of a disruptive nature.
- 6.9.38. I note and accept the NTA's response that the existing delineated 5 parallel spaces along the eastern side of this car park are not practical to use as the residual circulation aisle is less than 3m wide, which is much too narrow for a vehicle to enter or exit the perpendicular space if there is a car parked in the opposite parallel space. The effective number of parking spaces is therefore 15. The net effect of the Proposed Scheme will be to reduce the number of parking spaces from 15 to 12 (9 public spaces + 3 taxi spaces), resulting in a net loss of 3 spaces overall, rather than 8 as stated in this submission. EIAR Volume 2 Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport provides an assessment of the impact of the Proposed Scheme for parking at this location in Section 6.4.6.1.2.4 as having a Negative, Slight and Long-Term effect.
- 6.9.39. It is acknowledged that the EIAR at Chapter 6 (6.4.6.1.2.4) incorrectly describes the off-street parking spaces on west side of Kimmage Road Lower south of Sundrive Road as "permit parking". These are private parking spaces on the landing areas in



front of the row of shops and businesses. For context at this location the EIAR notes that the residential properties on the eastern side of the street at this location have rear access with off-street parking, which applies to some of those properties, but not all of them. This aspect of the EIAR provides context for the inclusion of 16 new full-time on-street parking spaces along the eastern side of Kimmage Road Lower to improve the availability of parking for the local residential community who do not have off-street parking.

**6.9.40. Issues Raised in respect of Other Design Issues include:**

- KCR Junction: Left-slip lane south bound necessary for No.74 bus / some right-turns dangerous.
- Concern platforms at junctions with side streets missing.
- Concern of practicality of bus shelters on narrow footpaths (2440 Aideen Avenue, 2391 Priory Road, 2390 Kenilworth Park).
- Concern raised paving and road markings would impede access to laneway to rear of 126 to 136 Kimmage Road Lower.
- Concern of drainage problems at the junction of Rathgar Avenue and Harold's Cross Road.

6.9.41. The NTA submits that the scheme design provides suitable corner radii for all vehicles to turn left, including buses at KCR. It may be seen on the General Arrangement Drawing Sheet No.1 (EIAR Volume 3 Figures. Part 2) that on Terenure Road West the stop line for the westbound right-turn lane is set back further than the straight-ahead lane, which is to accommodate the over-sweep of a large vehicle turning left from Kimmage Road Lower. While the specific right-turn movement is not described in the relevant submission, it is presumably the northbound right-turn from Fortfield Road. Few vehicles turn right from the south at this junction because there

is a more direct route towards Terenure via Greenlea Road to the east. Presently a right-turning vehicle must perch in the middle of the junction and make an opposed turn without a filter signal. In the Proposed Scheme the north-south movements will be separated in the signal staging which will make an easier to make a right-turn from Fortfield Road. This modification will be made in the context of much reduced north-south traffic due to the nearby bus gate on Kimmage Road Lower at Ravensdale Park, and to allow southbound buses to turn right from the bus lane on the left onto Kimmage Road West separate from the general traffic movements, with the southbound right-turn lane removed.

6.9.42. I note the NTA's response that in the section of the route between the bus gates it is unnecessary to modify the minor junctions at side streets because Kimmage Road Lower will no longer be a main traffic route.

6.9.43. As set out in section 6.19 'Bus Stops' of this report, there is a specific type of cantilever bus shelter that is designed to be used where footpaths are narrow, as will be the case at several bus stops along Kimmage Road Lower. The existing bus stop No.2443 is an example.

6.9.44. The access to the laneway to the rear of houses 126 to 136 Kimmage Road Lower will not be impeded. Houses are located on the eastern side of the road opposite and a little north of the junction at Mount Argus View. In the Proposed Scheme a short section of segregated southbound cycle track will be provided at this junction where the existing road is very wide, and the right-turn lane will be removed and replaced with a dedicated right-turn facility for cyclists. There is a gap in the traffic island provided at the laneway, plus a yellow box to ensure clear access. This arrangement is noted in General Arrangement Drg. No. 04.

6.9.45. The NTA submit that the drainage problems at the junction of Rathgar Avenue and Harold's Cross Road can be rectified. This I consider acceptable and within the remit of the competent authority to uphold, when works are being carried out.

**6.9.46. Issues Raised in respect of Local Traffic Impacts Include:**

- 4 bus gates proposed should be reduced to 1 only at Harold's Cross Park.
- "White listing" for local traffic to pass through bus gates.
- Diversion of traffic with longer local trips.
- Objection to road closure at junction of Corrib Road with Derravaragh Road.
- Opposition to closure of Poddle Park to traffic.
- Southern bus gate should operate only 5 days rather than 7 days a week, with shorter hours.
- Restriction for Left-turn eastbound from Sundrive Road to Kimmage Road Lower.
- Concern of more traffic on Clareville Road, impact to schools.
- Concern of impact of road closures for local community to access to various amenities and businesses.
- Alternative routes for local traffic and need for further modal filters.
- Commercial impacts for Kimmage Village.
- Concern of impact upon delivery routes for businesses and bin lorries between bus gates.
- Traffic restriction at Kenilworth Park East onto Harold's Cross Road.

- Concern of traffic diversion to Rathgar Avenue by Bus Gate No.4 at Kenilworth Square.
- Concern of traffic impacts for Stannaway Road and other streets west of CBC.
- Concern of impact upon access to Mount Argus Church.
- Concern of impact upon access to Mount Jerome Cemetery.
- Concern of operational hours of the most northerly bus gate in Harold's Cross.

6.9.47. I note, at the outset, the duplication of issues raised and the cross over of assessing matters throughout this report. A response to the issues raised is peppered throughout the report and I aim to be consistent in terms of my response to concerns raised. This section of the report should be read in-conjunction with section 6.23 'Private Cars, Impact Upon Commercial / Service / Community Facilities.' This being said I highlight the response to individual issues raised by the NTA.

6.9.48. I accept that each of the proposed bus gates is necessary for a specific local purpose. Bus Gate No.2 on Kimmage Road Lower at the southern end of Harold's Cross Park will provide the primary control on the core bus corridor in terms of restricting general traffic to a small volume for local access only on a 24-hour / 7-day per week basis, which is essential to ensure suitable conditions for cyclists to share the Kimmage Road Lower in mixed traffic without segregated facilities. The southern Bus Gate No.1 at Ravensdale Park will control the traffic volume along the southern part of the corridor and will avoid the diversion of a large volume of traffic eastwards along Clareville Road past the primary schools at peak times. The most northerly Bus Gate No.3 at the junction of Kimmage Road Lower and Harold's Cross will divert southbound traffic away from Kimmage Road Lower at the most suitable interception point. In the northbound direction it will operate in the morning peak to avoid some traffic leaking around the western side of Harold's Cross Park to avoid delay on

Harold's Cross Road. Bus Gate No. 4 at Kenilworth Square North is necessary to enable the junction on Harold's Cross Road to operate more efficiently and to accommodate the introduction of a southbound right-turn. It would not be appropriate therefore to reduce the number of proposed bus gates.

- 6.9.49. With respect to "White listing" for local traffic to pass through bus gates. The NTA submit that it is not legally possible in Ireland to provide an exemption for some general traffic at a traffic restriction. This response is noted.
- 6.9.50. It is acknowledged that the Proposed Scheme will give rise to increased journey distances by car for some local trips, but this is necessary to achieve the necessary bus priority and for safe cycling conditions along Kimmage Road Lower. Some traffic will divert westward into the Kimmage/Crumlin residential area along Lorcan O'Toole Park and Stannaway Road and adjoining streets. This is confirmed in the EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport which provides details of the expected changes in traffic flows on the surrounding road network. However the impact upon these roads is assessed as acceptable in an urban environment.
- 6.9.51. Objections to road closure at junction of Corrib Road with Derravaragh Road are noted and the NTA response submits that for Corrib Road residents there will be only one access route from Kimmage Road Lower. It is acknowledged that some people are concerned about potential traffic congestion at the junction with Kimmage Road Lower. It is contended there will be a longer diversion route going south, with impact for the local shops. It is queried whether turn restrictions at Terenure Road West instead would not provide the required effect. The NTA submit that if Derravaragh Road is not closed at the southern side of the junction with Corrib Road there would be a significant risk of through traffic bypassing the bus gate on Kimmage Road Lower which would severely impact on the local community. Turning restrictions at Terenure Road West is not a suitable or practicable alternative option as this would

be difficult to enforce, and it would similarly restrict access for the local community if effective. In any event through traffic could circumvent such a restriction by entering Hazelbrook Road just north of Kimmage Crossroads to reach Derravaragh Road and Corrib Road to bypass the bus gate. There is precedence in the area for such road closures, which prove successful, nearby at Neagh Road and Mount Tallant Avenue.

- 6.9.52. The NTA submit that the same issues apply on Poddle Park as on Corrib Road, and the road closure is necessary to avoid through traffic diverting from Kimmage Road Lower onto this parallel street. This I accept as a valid response.
- 6.9.53. It is held and I agree that there will be a degree of parity across the wider community as there will be traffic restrictions on local streets both to the east and west of Kimmage Road Lower, as necessary to protect the amenity of the local community from the impact of diverted through traffic where possible and appropriate.
- 6.9.54. I note that EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport indicates in Table 6-50 that two-way traffic on Stannaway Road will increase by 253 PCUs per hour in the morning peak with a negative, slight, and long-term impact, however it has been acknowledged that the redistributed traffic will not lead to a significant deterioration of the operational capacity on the surrounding road network. The Proposed Scheme includes appropriate traffic management measures along the core bus corridor to best balance the requirements to improve road conditions along Kimmage Road Lower for public transport and cyclists, while limiting the local traffic impacts. To enable local access to the core bus corridor it is necessary for traffic to use alternative routes within the local road network which will lead to some increase in traffic along those adjoining streets. The impact assessment concludes on the basis of the capacity of the route that the “effect of redistributed traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme is deemed Not Significant and Long-Term”. No necessary

mitigation measures are therefore required. This is an urban environment, and general traffic is a typical consequence.

- 6.9.55. As described earlier for cycling facilities in general, a key purpose of the proposed southern Bus Gate on Kimmage Road Lower is to restrict the volume of traffic that will share the road with cyclists for reasons of safety and comfort for cyclists. Any further opening of the bus gate beyond the proposed hours of operation would reduce the suitability of Kimmage Road Lower for cyclists.
- 6.9.56. At the request of some local residents, the left-turn restriction eastbound from Sundrive Road to Kimmage Road Lower, was considered. However ultimately, it was omitted from the scheme because such a restriction would increase the volume of traffic along Clareville Road past the primary schools which would not be appropriate for safety reasons.
- 6.9.57. EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport indicates in Table 6-50 that traffic on Clareville Road will increase by 218 PCUs per hour in the morning peak with a negative, slight, and long-term impact, however it has been acknowledged that the redistributed traffic will not lead to a significant deterioration of the operational capacity on the surrounding road network. The Proposed Scheme includes appropriate traffic management measures along the core bus corridor to best balance the requirements to improve road conditions along Kimmage Road Lower for public transport and cyclists, while limiting the local traffic impacts.
- 6.9.58. I note some submissions suggest that there should be more local traffic restrictions with modal filters (bike gates), but without specifying specific locations. I agree that the local traffic restrictions proposed are appropriate and necessary to manage traffic that could be diverted by the proposed bus gates. The restrictions will also enable continuous quiet street cycle routes to both east and west of the Core Bus Corridor.

6.9.59. In the EIAR in Volume 2, Chapter 10, Population, provides an assessment of commercial amenity under the section for Economic Assessment, as follows:

“Commercial amenity effects arise from a combination of traffic, air quality, noise and visual effects as discussed in Section 10.4.4.2.1”

“The assessment concluded that these residual traffic, air quality, noise, and visual effects combine to create a Negative, Moderate to Positive, Moderate and Long-term amenity effect on all commercial businesses along the Proposed Scheme. Overall, a Positive, Not Significant and Long-term amenity effect is expected on the following community areas: Mount Argus, Harold’s Cross, Harrington Street and Francis Street. All other community areas (Templeogue, Kimmage Manor, Terenure, Rathgar, Clogher Road, Donore Avenue, Whitefriar Street and Meath Street and Merchants Quay) are expected to experience a Neutral, and Long-term amenity effect during the Operational Phase.”

6.9.60. Access for commercial deliveries can be routed through the junction of Sundrive Road and Kimmage Road Lower at all times, and through the southern Bus Gate No.1 outside of the operational hours. For bin lorries it is normal practice to reverse along quiet cul-de-sac roads rather than to turn around at the end, which is often impractical in a narrow street. This arrangement can apply on the section of Kimmage Road Lower north of Casimir Road where the distance to the farthest house is 170m and this practice has been accepted by the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in general, included as Appendix M2 of the Preliminary Design Report.

6.9.61. Bus Gate No.4 at Kenilworth Square North will divert westbound traffic onto Rathgar Avenue. A submission is concerned that the EIAR does not provide detailed traffic analysis of the impact. The necessity for Bus Gate No. 4 has been described above under Local Traffic Impacts as enabling better performance of this 5-arm junction, which is in the interest of all road-users. EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic &



Transport indicates in Table 6-50 that traffic on Rathgar Avenue Road will increase by 198 vehicles per hour in the morning peak. The EIAR impact assessment concludes on the basis of the capacity of the route that the “effect of redistributed traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme is deemed Not Significant and Long-Term”. This is considered acceptable and justified.

- 6.9.62. The submission for the Passionist Community (No.80) notes that the Proposed Scheme is broadly welcomed, but that the bus gate restrictions for traffic at Harold’s Cross Park should operate only at peak morning and evening periods between Monday and Friday so as to enable access from the north not to be diverted. Concerns are focussed around access to Mount Argus Church.
- 6.9.63. As set out above and throughout this report, Bus Gate No.2 on Kimmage Road Lower at Harold’s Cross Park needs to operate on a 24/7 basis so as to reduce traffic flows to the low level that is suitable for cyclists to share the road. I note that the NTA submit that for car access to Mount Argus from the north, the existing route from the northern end of Harold’s Cross Park is 0.8km long, while the alternative route via Kenilworth Park will be 1.5km long, an increase of 0.7km, which is only slightly longer.
- 6.9.64. The submission on behalf of Mount Jerrome Cemetery (No.78) describes the various existing access routes to the cemetery from 9 churches that regularly send funerals to the cemetery. It identifies the alternative routes that will be necessary because of the bus gates and other traffic restrictions that are proposed in the 3 Core Bus Corridor Schemes on the southern side of the city. In each case the submission demonstrates that there are suitable alternative routes available which are largely similar, or perhaps slightly longer. The NTA therefore surmise that the impact for access to the cemetery will therefore be only slightly affected by the proposed bus priority measures in the Proposed Scheme and the other adjoining CBC schemes.

- 6.9.65. With respect to the 24 hours restriction of southbound traffic at the most northerly bus gate in Harold's Cross. Section 4.6.4.3 of EIAR Chapter 4 describes the location of each proposed bus gate and then outlines the exceptions of the operational hours where these would not be on a 24-hour / 7-day week basis. In addition, the proposed bus gates operational times are confirmed in Table 4-9 of the Preliminary Design Report. The northerly bus gate in Harold's Cross will deflect southbound traffic at the most appropriate interception point and the operational hours need to match those of Bus Gate No.2 at the southern end of Harold's Cross Park.
- 6.9.66. Overall I consider that the NTA's response is reasonable and justifiable. I accept the explanation of the NTA for the design of the scheme, this is a complex urban constrained route. I am satisfied that the NTA have on balance chosen the best and most useable option to provide for present and future residents to walk and cycle safely and directly to/from the city centre. I highlight that the assessment of routes and options was an iterative process and, great care was taken to minimise the impact on adjacent properties and to reduce land acquisitions to the extent possible while still meeting the project's objectives. This approach was adopted to balance the necessity of the development with the preservation of the interests and rights of property owners in the area.
- 6.9.67. The proposed scale of the BusConnects CBC Infrastructure Works will be transformational for cycling in Dublin, delivering a large number of the primary cycling routes identified in the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network plan. With proposals of this scale, I agree and fundamentally believe, it is critical that the overall design approach matches the stated ambition and can achieve a longevity that such investment deserves.

## **6.10. Section 2 - Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal.**

6.10.1. The Proposed Scheme along this section of the corridor, is described in detail in section 3.0 Proposed Development section of this report above. Some 25 number submissions have been received in relation to section 2. Submissions are concerned with the following issues:

- Road widening impacts:
  - Objections to road widening with CPO on Harold's Cross Road.
  - Road widening at Greenmount Close, Harold's Cross Road: Traffic Noise closer to homes, negative impact on air quality.
- Cycling facilities:
  - Width of cycle track at 79-85 Harold's Cross Road (east side just north of park) behind the parking. Risk of car doors opening into path of cyclists.
- Trees and public realm:
- Parking:
  - Car park at Hospice inconsistent with planning policies. Not suitable location for Park & Ride.
- Bus stops:
  - Move of bus stop north from Greenmount Close, Harold's Cross Road.
- Local traffic impacts:
  - Close through traffic route between Greenmount Avenue and Greenmount Lane.

- Yellow box at Armstrong Street junction.
- Traffic through Mount Drummond Area and O'Hara Avenue
- Reinstate the right-turn at Grand Canal to Grove Road

• Drainage:

- Drainage problems on Harold's Cross Road / Mount Drummond.

6.10.2. It is noted that the directly affected property owners along Harold's Cross Road where road widening is proposed have not objected to the principle of the land acquisition, apart from some concerns about impacts by some occupants of Greenmount Close. The NTA has consulted with the affected property owners and explained the need for the road widening which is necessary to accommodate segregated cycling facilities along this key radial route into Dublin City Centre.

6.10.3. I highlight that the proposed scheme design will not bring traffic closer to homes at Greenmount Close, as a cycle track will be provided in the road widening, which will realign the footpath partially into the garden area. The sources of the noise from general traffic and from buses in the bus lane will remain approximately in the same locations, and therefore there will be no increase in noise for the residents at Greenmount Close due to greater proximity to the road.

6.10.4. Consideration is had that the Proposed Scheme will divert some traffic away from Harold's Cross as a result of the proposed bus gates on Kimmage Road Lower and will no longer be a viable traffic route to and from Dublin City Centre. In the EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6, Table 6-48 it is indicated that traffic on Harold's Cross Road in the AM peak hour will reduce from 1,239 vehicles per hour to 895 vehicles per hour, a reduction of 28%. Table 7.36 in Section 7.5.2 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality) in Volume 2 of the EIAR identifies that a summary of the Operational Phase predicted road traffic

impacts on local human receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme are assessed as being **Neutral, Long-term**.

- 6.10.5. With regard to Operational Phase Vibration, the predicted impact is assessed as **Neutral, Imperceptible and Short to Long-Term**. The cumulative impact of the Proposed Scheme in conjunction with other Core Bus Corridor schemes in the same part of the city in terms of traffic and transport can be found in Chapter 21 (Cumulative Impacts & Environmental Interactions) of the EIAR, as well as in Appendix A6.1 (TIA Report) in Volume 4 of the EIAR. This assessment describes how there will be substantial modal shift (TIA Appendix A6.1 page 6) of transport demand from private car to more sustainable modes of public transport and cycling across Dublin as a result of the increased capacity, efficiency, and reliability of these other modes of transport. Overall car travel on the radial routes towards the city will reduce by approximately 32%, along the core bus corridors.
- 6.10.6. I note and agree that similarly to the response for traffic noise, there should be an improvement in air quality at Greenmount Close due to the reduction of general traffic flow as a result of the proposed bus gates along the Kimmage Core Bus Corridor.
- 6.10.7. A submission expresses concern about the proposed cycle track on the eastern side of Harold's Cross Road just north of park which will be located behind the parking in terms of the risk of car doors opening into path of cyclists. The proposed road layout in front of 79-85 Harold's Cross Road includes a 2.3m wide parallel parking bay alongside a 1.5m wide cycle track. The issue raised is the risk of car doors opening into the path of cyclists. Between the parallel parking space and cycle track there is a 0.4m physical kerb separation and another 0.4m up to the cycle line markings on the cycle track. This equals to a 0.8m space between the parking space and cycle track. In accordance with the Cycle Design Manual (September 2023) "a buffer (0.75m

recommended width) should be provided between the cycle lane and parking bays to allow for passenger access/egress, loading and to prevent 'dooring' of cyclists".

- 6.10.8. In addition, this type of layout is a cost-effective means of separating cyclists from traffic as the parallel parking space acts as a physical separator between cyclists and traffic. If the cycle track were located on the outer side of the parking bay, then vehicles accessing the parking would have to cross the cycle track including when reversing into a space. Such an arrangement would give rise to increased risks for cyclists who might be tempted to overtake a vehicle doing a parking manoeuvre by ducking into the bus lane unexpectedly. The arrangement in the Proposed Scheme is in accordance with both the Cycle Design Manual and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets.
- 6.10.9. With respect to concerns raised to the proposed public car park, I note the NTA submission that the car park is proposed to mitigate the loss of existing on-street parking nearby that will be removed for the provision of a cycle track. It will provide an additional 12 spaces, in recognition of the restricted availability of public parking in an area where few houses have driveways, and to reduce the risk of illegal parking on the proposed cycle tracks along Harold's Cross Road. Overall I consider that the proposed car park at this location has been justified by the NTA and considered it acceptable.
- 6.10.10. The NTA note that the proposed car park at the hospice, is not a Park and Ride facility, it will operate like all other public parking in the area for short stays with fairly high tariffs, and for local residents with permits at a modest annual charge. The location is just within the High Demand Red Zone, as indicated on the Dublin City Council Parking Control Map. I concur that the proposed car park could not be reasonably described as a Park and Ride facility.

6.10.11. It is highlighted that an area of land under zoning objective Z15 (Community and Social Infrastructure), within the confines of Our Lady's Hospice along Harold's Cross Road, is required to facilitate Construction Compound K2 during the Construction Phase and a proposed new public car park during the Operational Phase.

6.10.12. I note that:

'Permissible uses' for the Z15 (Community and Social Infrastructure) zoning objective relevant to the subject lands include, inter alia:

- Community Facility.

'Open for consideration Uses' include, inter alia:

- Car park ancillary to main use.

6.10.13. The NTA submit that following consideration of several possible locations, proposals for a public car park at Our Lady's Hospice was selected, to the front of the site nearest Harold's Cross Road. The proposed car park will be controlled by Dublin City Council and visitors to Our Lady's Hospice can use it. As part of the Proposed Scheme, Our Lady's Hospice entrance gate will move westwards to beyond the car park which can be controlled by the Hospice. The historic gates on Harold's Cross Road will remain in their existing position, however, they will no longer close as the driveway to the proposed car park will become part of the public road. It is contended that the location of the proposed car park will not impact upon the integrity of the hospice use and has the least impact for the future development and operation of same, while compensating for the loss of some existing public parking on the street nearby.

6.10.14. With respect to moving of a bus stop from the Greenmount Close, Harolds Cross Road (bus stop No.1344) 140m further north. The NTA acknowledge the

concern raised that this amendment to the bus stop location will present an inconvenience for the resident of Greenmount Close who has a disability.

6.10.15. Cognisance is had to The Supplementary Information, Preliminary Design Report, Appendix H contains the Bus Stop Review Report, which was carried out to inform the design and assessed the locations of the existing bus stops to determine whether a stop should be removed, relocated, or remain in the same location. This exercise was carried out in order to optimise the performance of the bus service along this route by reducing journey time of the bus service, to increase the walking catchment of the bus stops and to ensure key trip attractors located along the route are sufficiently covered within the catchment of bus stops. The assessment demonstrated that the relocation of this bus stop was an appropriate intervention to maximise the benefits to the bus service in this area. It will be in a more suitable location and the move will contribute to the overall improvement of the bus services by reducing the need for buses to stop twice on this short section of street. It will require 2 minutes additional walking time to reach the new bus stop from the current location. If the existing bus stop were to be retained, it would be necessary to widen the footpath locally for a narrow bus stop island, which would increase the encroachment into the property at Greenmount Close in the Compulsory Purchase Order. The existing bus stop also clashes with the location for the proposed new pedestrian crossing across Harold's Cross Road to provide more direct access to St. Clare's primary school. I consider that the response to the concerns raised with regard to bus stop relocation are reasonable, considered and have merit. This is a suburban to city centre location, with a heavily trafficked route. I am of the opinion consistency, transparency and a plan lead approach is required for the common good, in the interests of fairness and being beneficial to all members of the community and public.



6.10.16. The NTA response sets out that the drainage problems on Harold's Cross Road / Mount Drummond junction raised as a concern, can be rectified. Harold's Cross Road will be reconstructed as part of the proposed road widening, and this will include a new surface water drainage system as is shown in EIAR Volume 3 Figures, Part 11 Proposed Surface Water Drainage Works, Sheet 7. This is considered acceptable and incumbent on any competent authority carrying out works, the nature of which is proposed, in the subject scheme.

6.10.17. With respect to the request that through traffic route between Greenmount Avenue and Greenmount Lane be closed. The NTA submit that the Traffic Impact Assessment has indicated that there will be a substantial reduction in traffic volumes along Harold's Cross Road. It is highlighted that Greenmount Lane and Greenmount Avenue are very narrow streets where two-way traffic can only pass on a give-way basis. It is submitted this not an attractive short-cut route from the main roads as there would be a risk of delay if another vehicle were encountered in the opposite direction. I agree that if there were to be a road closure on these streets it would cause unnecessary disruption and inconvenience for the local residents and businesses. Vehicles on Greenmount Lane would need to make a difficult U-turn on the very narrow street to be able to exit northwards rather than simply continuing along Greenmount Avenue out onto Harold's Cross Road. The NTA's response, that there would be little advantage gained, and much disruption caused by a traffic restriction as suggested, is accepted.

6.10.18. With respect to the request by Mount Drummond District Residents Association that yellow box at Armstrong Street junction be retained and expanded. I note the NTA's response that there will be yellow boxes provided on Harold's Cross Road opposite the side street junctions to enable local traffic to exit onto the main road, or to turn across the opposing traffic to enter the side street. This is shown in

EIAR Volume 3 Figures, Part 2 General Arrangement drawings Sheet 7 in the Proposed Scheme. While I note the yellow box opposite Armstrong Street is being amended I consider it will function as designed and is acceptable from a traffic perspective.

6.10.19. A submission raises a concern about the potential for some traffic to divert from Harold's Cross Road through the Mount Drummond area via O'Hara Avenue to make an illegal right-turn onto Grove Road to avoid the proposed right-turn ban at Robert Emmet Bridge. I agree this is an enforcement issue should a problem arises in this respect during the operational phase, it can be addressed through the proposed camera enforcement system and An Garda Siochana.

6.10.20. With respect to the request that the right-turn at Grand Canal to Grove Road be reinstated. The NTA have responded that the northbound right-turn from Harold's Cross Road onto Grove Road eastbound is to be restricted, so as to enable full bus priority in the northbound direction towards Clanbrassil Street Upper. Currently a small volume of right-turn traffic causes the straight-ahead traffic to move into the left-lane where the bus lane is curtailed short of the junction. In many similar situations along the Grand Canal the right-turn is restricted, as is the case in the opposing southbound direction from Clanbrassil Street towards Parnell Road. The demand for this right-turn can displace to other routes, such as Clogher Road a short distance to the west, which is the alternative route from the Kimmage direction due to the proposed bus gates. Some traffic can instead turn right at Leonard's Corner onto South Circular Road a short distance further north. The right-turn onto Grove Road cannot be retained if proper bus priority is to be provided at this major junction along the Core Bus Corridor. I consider the response reasonable. As already stated, I consider "Watering down" of the benefits of the scheme by making localised changes to the design is not recommended.

### **6.11. Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.**

6.11.1. The Proposed Scheme along this section of the corridor, is described in detail in section 3.0 Proposed Development, section of this report above. Some 24 number submissions have been received. Submissions are concerned with the following issues:

- Alternative Road Layout Options to widening at Robert Emmet Bridge
- Visual impact of footbridges at Robert Emmet Bridge
- Road widening at Clanbrassil Street Upper and historic retaining wall.
- Parapet wall removal on Clanbrassil Street Upper west side.
- Removal of on-street parking on Clanbrassil Street Upper
- Loading for Deliveries on Clanbrassil Street Lower
- Construction Compound K3 at St. Patrick's Court

6.11.2. In arriving at the proposal to widen the road at Robert Emmett Bridge, the NTA considered three alternatives as described in Volume 2, Chapter 3 Alternatives, Section 3.4.1.3.2. of the EIAR. This assessment concluded that the most suitable arrangement would be to provide new footbridges on both sides of the existing road bridge, which would remain intact. To enable the continuation of bus lanes and cycle tracks along Clanbrassil Street Upper, it will be necessary to widen the road by approximately 4m where it is on an embankment with a retaining wall on the western side. I note and accept the NTA's response that there are no other reasonable alternatives to this road widening, apart from the omission of both bus lanes, which would cause a major interruption to continuity of bus priority.

- 6.11.3. I agree that the options of omitting the bus lanes at Robert Emmet Bridge and the northern approach ramp on Clanbrassil Street Upper so as to avoid the need for widening at the bridge, would undermine the key objective to maximise bus priority on this critical link of the core bus corridor which is congested at present with delays for buses.
- 6.11.4. With respect to the issue raised of the aesthetics of footbridges at Robert Emmet Bridge, by the City Archaeologist and Conservation Section of DCC. The NTA acknowledges the high-quality visual appearance of Robert Emmet Bridge with the distinctive balustraded parapets. In designing the proposed new footbridges, it is contended that, the structure was arranged to align carefully with the key features of the existing bridge with a slim deck and glass parapets such that the old bridge will remain highly visible behind the new bridge. This is illustrated in the photomontages included in Vol 3, Chapter 17, Figures 2-7-2 of the EIAR, showing the existing situation, and in Figure 2-7-3 showing the proposed situation. In addition, pedestrians (and cyclists on the western footbridge) will have a close-up view of the façade of the old bridge from the new footbridges so that they can better appreciate the aesthetics of the old bridge.
- 6.11.5. I note that the Grand Canal Conservation Area encompasses the circular line of the Grand Canal, built in 1790, including its tow paths, locks and Robert Emmett Bridge (NIAH 50080983) but also the mid 19th century buildings facing on to the north and south banks at Windsor Terrace (NIAH 50080989), Parnell Road and Grove Road (NIAH 50081042). The remaining structures fronting on to the Grand Canal within the Proposed Scheme are 20th century. Heritage kerbs are also identified along Robert Emmett Bridge (CBC0011BTH136). The Grand Canal Conservation Area and Robert Emmett Bridge are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity.

- 6.11.6. Having carried out a site visit and reviewed the photomontages and plans submitted I am in agreement with the applicant that the new pedestrian / cycle bridges which will facilitate the widening of the road from two to four lanes, are visually acceptably. The new bridges have a visually, non-intrusive, lightweight design and most features of significant value in the view will be retained and will remain visible e.g. key features of the bridge (balustrade, piers and ornamental lighting columns). I highlight that views of the ornamented balustrade, piers, masonry walls and capping and canal side trees, will be retained / preserved by the use of the glass parapet. I note that the proposals will result in a change of the character of the bridge but overall I consider the impact does not damage the visual amenity of the historic bridge and is acceptable with respect to architectural heritage impact.
- 6.11.7. With respect to road widening with CPO at Clanbrassil Street Upper, the NTA has consulted with the affected property owners and explained the need for the road widening, which is necessary to achieve full bus priority and segregated cycling facilities along this key radial route into Dublin City Centre, and to achieve the project objectives. EIAR Chapter 10 (Volume 2) acknowledges the significance of the residual impact of this aspect of the Proposed Scheme in Section 10.4.4.1.2.1 as follows: "To accommodate the widening of the carriageway to the north of Robert Emmet Bridge, demolition of the residential property at 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper (at Gordon's Fuel) is required. The land take effect on this residential property is Negative, Profound and Long-term."
- 6.11.8. For the proposed widening of Clanbrassil Street Upper on the western side of the road, it will be necessary to construct a new retaining wall. The existing masonry parapet wall will be disassembled, and the materials will be reused in the parapet of the new wall. This is described in the EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 4, Section 4.5.3.8.1, in Chapter 5, Section 5.5.4.1.4, and in the Preliminary Design Report Section 8.5.1

(Supplementary Information). The NTA submit that if all of the existing masonry retaining wall materials were to be salvaged as requested by the City Archaeologist, this would require very difficult temporary works for a sheet pile wall to be installed behind the existing wall with associated closure of half of the public road, which would cause major disruption for all road users over a long period of time. Such an arrangement, it is submitted, would not be practicable. Instead, it is proposed to face the new wall with masonry similar to the old wall. At the abutments of Robert Emmet Bridge the new structures will be carefully integrated with the existing masonry wing walls so as to preserve as much as possible of the old structures. This I consider is an acceptable approach given the overall improvements and aims and objectives of the project to be carried out, with the least amount of disruption as possible and within a reasonable timeframe as possible.

6.11.9. I highlight that the City Archaeologist requests revised design proposals for the proposed footbridges and retaining walls at Robert Emmet Bridge and along Clanbrassil Street Upper. However, in agreement with the NTA I am satisfied that the Proposed Scheme design has been carefully developed to maximise the retention of historic features in so far as is practicable in the proposed widening works. The proposed footbridges are lightweight and low-key so as to maximise visibility of Robert Emmett Bridge and will be sensitively integrated with the existing bridge supports and adjoining abutments and walls. An information board will be provided on the eastern footbridge to replicate the Robert Emmet Memorial which will no longer be directly visible for pedestrians. Heritage materials will be salvaged and reused in the new retaining wall.

6.11.10. A submission from several residents at 50/51/52 Clanbrassil Street Upper has objected to the removal of existing on-street parking and loading. The NTA submit that to enable reliable bus priority along Clanbrassil Street Upper it is necessary to

remove the existing 3 part-time parking spaces in the bus lane on the eastern side of the street. Some of the adjoining houses on this section of street have driveways for off-street parking. There is no existing loading bay on that side of the street. The parking on the western side of the street will be modified to enable the provision of a cycle track with a reduction from 8 to 6 parking spaces.

6.11.11. The impact of the Proposed Scheme for Parking and Loading in Section 3 is assessed, and should be read in conjunction with the Traffic and Transport assessment, in the EIA section 8.0 of this report and section 6.19 'Removal of Parking and Loading bays'. I note that the EIAR sets out:

"As shown in Table 6-32 of the EIAR proposed amendments to parking / loading will result in a loss of 19 spaces along Section 3. Where parking is removed, the impact varies between negligible and slight. The overall significance of effect is assessed as Negative, Slight and Long-Term, primarily as a result of the loss of Pay & Display / permit parking on R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower between South Circular Road and Lombard Street West. This slight effect is considered acceptable in the context of the planned outcome of the Proposed Scheme, which is to improve accessibility to this local area (on foot, by bicycle and bus) for residents and visitors to local shops and businesses."

6.11.12. I note that some businesses on the section of Clanbrassil Street Lower immediately north of the Leonard's Corner junction are concerned about the provisions for loading on the western side of the street. There is no existing loading bay at this location, with two parking spaces provided outside the cycle lane, which will be removed in the Proposed Scheme to facilitate the provision of segregated cycle tracks on both sides of the street. The overall significance of effect is assessed, in the EIAR, as Negative, Slight and Long-Term, primarily as a result of the loss of pay & display / permit parking on R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower. This slight effect is

considered acceptable in the context of the planned outcome of the Proposed Scheme, which is to greatly improve accessibility to this local area (on foot, by bicycle and bus) for residents and visitors to local shops and businesses.

6.11.13. Several submissions raised concerns about the impacts of the proposed Construction Compound K3 located on parts of the public plaza area, as well as the long-term proposals for tree planting as part of an upgrade to the urban realm after the compound is removed. The proposed construction compound K3 is described in EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.7.

6.11.14. I acknowledge the NTA response that when roads and streets are being upgraded, there will be some temporary disruption / alterations to on-street and off-street parking provision, and access to premises in certain locations along the Proposed Scheme. Local arrangements will be made on a case-by-case basis to maintain continued access to homes and businesses affected by the works, at all times, where practicable. Details regarding temporary access provisions will be discussed with residents and business owners prior to construction starting in the area. The duration of the works will vary from property to property, but access and egress will be maintained at all times.

6.11.15. In addition, the appointed contractor will be required to put in place a Communications Plan in accordance with the NTA's requirements to inform the public (and affected properties) in advance of construction works of a disruptive nature. Section 5.1.6 in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in Appendix A5.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

6.11.16. The two existing main access pathways to the businesses (The Wine Pair and South Dublin Electrical Wholesale) on the western side of St. Patrick's Court from the east and north will remain open at all times so that the accessibility of the businesses is not impeded.



- 6.11.17. To compensate for reduced visibility of the businesses caused by temporary buildings in the construction compound, temporary signage will be provided beside the main footpath along the road edge. Section 5.5.3.2 in Chapter 5 in Volume 2 of the EIAR addresses access to property during construction.
- 6.11.18. There is an existing loading bay a short distance to the north, of construction compound K3, which will remain operational at all times during the construction period. Therefore, loading to the businesses will not be restricted at any stage.
- 6.11.19. A degree of visual disturbance is inevitable while the compound (K3) is in operation. However, the compound has been divided into two small areas to minimise this impact and to maintain sightlines across the area to the businesses on the western side of the street as much as possible. In particular, the main access pathways from the east and north will remain open at all times which will provide clear visibility towards the businesses.
- 6.11.20. Overall, in respect of construction compound K3, Section 17.4.3.1.3 in Chapter 17 addresses townscape and visual impact during construction:  
“...Construction Compound K3, which will be small, is to be located on an existing part-grass / part-paved public space fronting St. Patrick’s Court / Greenville Place along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower. The construction works will be wide-ranging along the road corridor and will result in substantial alterations to the existing streetscape character. The construction works will not alter the existing townscape character along this section of the Proposed Scheme, but the presence of construction activity will be an impact on streetscape. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is medium. The potential townscape / streetscape effect of the Construction Phase is assessed to be Negative, Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term”.

6.11.21. I note that the compound has been divided into two small areas to minimise the potential screening effect in front of the buildings on the western side of St. Patrick's Court, which should reduce the risk for the security of the adjoining premises, and of anti-social behaviour. I consider that the temporary loss of the small green spaces, to provide for temporary construction compounds, will be short-term, and they will be reinstated with enhanced planting as shown in the landscaping drawings (EIAR Volume 3 Figures, Part 5, Sheet 8) to improve the amenity for long-term benefit to the local community and businesses. It is considered that with the proposed mitigation measures and the temporary duration of the construction compound, it is unlikely that there will be a loss of business that could cause the owners to seek to relocate to another premises.

6.11.22. One submission suggested an alternative location for the construction compound at St. Vincent's Street car park a short distance to the south and on the eastern side of the street. The NTA response sets out that in the Proposed Scheme there will be a reduction in on-street parking along Clanbrassil Street Lower in this vicinity. If the construction compound were to be located at the small St. Vincent's Street car park that would further reduce the amount of public parking in the area to serve the local businesses, which would be undesirable compared to the proposed location where no parking impact would arise. Ultimately there is a need for temporary construction compounds and I consider the NTA's response is acceptable, there will be temporary disruption but it is necessary and reasonable.

## **6.12. Impacts for Businesses**

6.12.1. Concerns raised in respect to access to businesses due to construction compound K3 at St. Patrick's Court and loading for businesses on Clanbrassil Street Lower have been dealt with above in the preceding sections of this report. I note further concern

is raised with respect to general impact for businesses and bin lorries along the route and that every journey is not into the city centre. Concern is raised that access will be restricted to many businesses at Portobello, Harold's Cross, and Kimmage, with diverted delivery routes to get past many bus gates across the southwest sector, with 20 bus gates on 5 bus corridors.

6.12.2. The NTA response submits that the BusConnects Network Redesign is introducing a grid-type bus network that allows passengers to interchange between services on journeys in any direction across the city, rather than the previous network that was heavily focussed on the radial corridors. New and more frequent orbital bus routes are improving the speed and reliability of linked bus journeys across the urban area. Thus, it will be easier and quicker to travel across the city on a variety of routes once BusConnects is fully implemented. This is the main reason why the proposals are being put forward at the same time so as to provide a wider benefit than could be achieved by piecemeal adjustments along individual corridors. For business trips throughout the day that are not suitable for public transport, there will remain an extensive route network available. While the overall number of bus gates may seem significant, they are widely dispersed across a big network, and each will have a mainly localised impact on a section of each bus corridor. There are many other non-bus corridor routes that will remain available for general traffic.

6.12.3. I note and agree with the assessment and view put forward by the NTA in respect of impact upon businesses as a result of the proposed scheme, including impact upon deliveries. The bus gates are not expected to have a significant impact on private vehicles accessing commercial businesses along these stretches of roads due to the lack of on-street parking provision, however they will impact accessibility in terms of lengthened and re-routed journeys.

- 6.12.4. I acknowledge that the proposed scheme will deliver positive impacts to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users which will facilitate greater capacity along the corridor for users of sustainable modes of transport to access properties. I refer the Board to the overall assessment of 'The Economic Impact of the Core Bus Corridors' included in Appendix A10.2 in Volume 4 of the EIAR. The assessment indicates that evidence from case studies suggests that, in some cases, businesses overestimate the number of people arriving by car whilst the proposed enhancements to the walking, cycling and bus infrastructure along the route will increase use of sustainable transport and may positively impact on footfall to the business.
- 6.12.5. There is strong international evidence to suggest that the proposed improvements will lead to further increases in the use of sustainable transport. This should, in turn, more than compensates for reductions in visits by car users, due to the likely reductions in general traffic along the proposed corridor. Whilst spend per visitor may fall slightly, the overall spend rises due to the increased overall footfall. This effect should occur as soon as the new proposed routes open with shoppers choosing to make even more use of sustainable transport options. There is limited evidence of the impact during the construction work, as this is finite.
- 6.12.6. I highlight that access for commercial deliveries can be routed through the junction of Sundrive Road and Kimmage Road Lower at all times, and through the southern Bus Gate No.1 outside of the operational hours. For bin lorries it is normal practice to reverse along quiet cul-de-sac roads rather than to turn around at the end, which is often impractical in a narrow street.
- 6.12.7. The necessity for the Bus Gates is assessed, throughout the report and in detail in under section 6.13 Bus Gates and Larkview FC. The necessity for the bus gates, enabling better performance for sustainable transport, which is in the interests of all road-users has been justified, on the basis of the capacity of the route and that the

effect of redistributed traffic associated with the proposed scheme is deemed Not Significant and Long-Term.

Paragraph 6.3 above sets out 'the justification and need' for the project and paragraph 6.3.4 sets out the local destinations that generate demand along the route, such as, inter alia, Mount Argus Church, Mount Jerome Cemetery in Harold's Cross, Kimmage Village, Terenure Village, Crumlin Village, Harold's Cross Village, the urban village at Leonard's corner, various schools, local retail and business cluster on R817 Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with Corrib Road and employment sites. Paragraph 6.7 'Project / Junction Design' and paragraph 6.8 'Issues Raised' respond to impact upon businesses, need for and operation times of bus gates, concerns raised regarding access to Mount Jerome Cemetery, Our Lady's Hospice / Proposed Car Park and Mount Argus Church. Concerns raised with respect to impact to Tesco Ireland on LKR, Capital Glass Co. Gordons Fuels, Larkview FC, The Wine Pair. Thom's Pharmacy and Opticians is considered in further detail below.

#### **Tesco Ireland**

- 6.12.8. With respect to Tesco Ireland's request for a loading bay at their premises on Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with Corrib Road. Their concern of a suitable delivery window during the bus gates operational hours for deliveries (HGVs) to pass through bus gates. Also, their query regarding the removal of an existing loading bay to the front of Tesco Express on the South Circular Road close to its Junction with Clanbrassil Street, just east of Leonards Corner. The NTA submit that currently there is no loading bay currently at the shop on LKR and parking is informal with a clearway in the evening peak. This I agreed is the position on the ground. In the proposed scheme the clearway restriction will be removed as it will no longer be required in the context of the proposed bus gate. Some 5 parking spaces will be

delineated at the row of shops, to the front of Tesco Express, on LKR but there will be no formal parking controls. I note and agree with the NTA's response that the business owner can apply to the local authority, Dublin City Council, for a part-time loading bay to be applied at the shop if they consider it necessary, and this would not be precluded by the proposed scheme.

6.12.9. With regard to bus gates and impact upon deliveries, servicing and accessibility. As stated above in 'Issues Raised' section of this report, it is not legally possible in Ireland to provide an exemption for some general traffic (delivery HGV's) at a traffic restriction. Also, as already stated, a key purpose of the proposed southern Bus Gate on Kimmage Road Lower is to restrict the volume of traffic that will share the road with cyclists for reasons of safety and comfort for cyclists. I note the submission that any further opening of the bus gate beyond the proposed hours of operation would reduce the suitability of Kimmage Road Lower for cyclists. Delivery vehicles and general traffic can proceed southwards through the bus gate at off-peak periods when it is open to traffic.

6.12.10. Overall, I consider the provision of the bus gates and their operational hours to be appropriate and in the best interests of promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport, ensuring public transport priority, and minimising the overall impacts of the proposed scheme. I note that contrary to the opinion that bus gate hours should be shortened, some submissions consider BusGates should operate 24/7, or at least be extended to cover school closure times in the afternoons.

6.12.11. With respect to the removal of one loading bay from the front of the Tesco Express on South Circular Road. I note Drg. 08 of the General Arrangement Drawings does not include a loading bay at this location. Formal cycle paths are indicated on both sides of the South Circular Road for a short section from the junction with Clanbrassil Street and a bus lane is proposed on the southern side of

the street opposite Tesco Express. The NTA response does not deal with this matter. From my assessment of section 6.4.6.1.2.4 Parking and Loading of Chapter 6 of the EIAR there is no mention of removal of the loading bay at this location. From General Arrangement Drg. 08 it is clear this portion of the SCR is included within the red line boundary of the Kimmage CBC project and the loading bay is removed. Given that the loading bay infringes into the carriageway and there is car parking to the rear of the Tesco Express I consider the removal of the loading bay to accommodate safer cycling and free flow of traffic acceptable at this location.

6.12.12. I am satisfied with the overall level of priority afforded to buses along the route. The figures presented in the EIAR show that the Proposed Scheme will have beneficial impacts in terms of time savings and reliability for bus services. It has also been shown that there is the scope to increase the number of bus services on the route without compromising reliability. It is essential on all BusConnects corridors that the bus service is given priority. DCC states that links to bus information in relation to traffic flow management will be upgraded to improve this service and ensure free flow for buses. This digital improvement is necessary to ensure the scheme operates to its full potential. As stated throughout this report, DCC have carried out modelling work to mimic the real-life operation of the project. I acknowledge that the design of this scheme is difficult and complex and has called for multiple interventions along the road network in order to achieve its objectives. The use of bus priority signals, bus gates and a combination of one-way systems and turn bans are all intended to alter the current traffic situation along the route and ensure that public transport, walking and cycling can be prioritised over the private car. Again any "Watering down" of the benefits of the scheme by making localised changes to the design is not recommended.

**Capital Glass Co.**

6.12.13. I note concern of impact to Capital glass business. It is submitted that the business gets weekly collections by large trucks to recycle broken glass. Concern is raised that skip use will be impeded and therefore the business will be severely impacted. Loading for businesses on Clanbrassil Street Lower is dealt with in the preceding section of this report under 'Issues Raised'. The NTA response submits that there is no existing loading bay at this location, with two parking spaces provided outside the cycle lane, which will be removed in the proposed scheme to facilitate the provision of segregated cycle tracks on both sides of the street. The proposed segregated continuous cycle lane will continue behind the proposed bus stops and shelter, on both sides of the road, with a continuous outward bus lane. This is a welcome improvement to safe, continuous, segregated cycle priority. I note there is a revised parking arrangement proposed on the eastern side of Clanbrassil Street Lower opposite Capital Glass Co. premises. Given that there is no existing loading bay I see no change in circumstance for Capitol Glass Co in terms of impediment of use of a skip. The impact of the proposed scheme for parking and loading in Section 3 is assessed in the EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 6 Traffic & Transport, Section 6.4.6.1.4.4 as Negative, Slight and Long-Term.

**Dawnlane Limited (No.31 Clanbrassil Street Upper) / Mullens Scrap and Gordons Fuels (No.32a Clanbrassil Street Upper)**

6.12.14. Concern is raised of access and impact upon (Gordon's Fuels), and at No.31 Clanbrassil Street Upper (Mullen Scrap) located to the west side of Clanbrassil Street Upper, just north of Robert Emmett Bridge. Concern centres around access to lands being extinguished or reduced, accessibility to their businesses both during and after construction and impact upon property rights. Concern is also raised of impact upon future redevelopment potential of their property, which is zoned Z3, Neighbourhood



zoned lands. It is requested that ABP request additional information on the alternatives to the proposed bridge widening and new junction creation on Clanbrassil Street.

6.12.15. I acknowledge that the CPO involves demolishing a private residence. No 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper (a small bungalow). It will be demolished to allow for segregated pedestrian and cycle paths to be constructed at Robert Emmett Bridge and to accommodate construction of a new access ramp to Gordon's Fuels. Works will entail the removal of the existing 18th Century masonry retaining wall along the edge of the access lane. It will lead to road widening with construction of a new masonry faced retaining wall at No.29 to 32 Clanbrassil Street Upper with a revised ramped access lane to Gordon's Fuels at No.32a on the north side of the Grand Canal, north / west of Robert Emmet Bridge.

6.12.16. Regard is had to the general arrangement drawings and photomontages submitted of changes and potential effects resulting from the proposed scheme. The upgrade at Robert Emmett Bridge will alter the existing access to properties on the north-west side of the bridge, there will be some temporary disruption / alterations to on-street and off-street parking provision, and access to premises. The project design, justification and need for the proposed scheme is set out in detail in section 6.3 and 6.7 of this report. I note that the NTA submit that local arrangements will be made on a case-by-case basis to maintain continued access to homes and businesses affected by the works, at all times, where practicable. Details regarding temporary access provisions will be discussed with residents and business owners prior to construction starting in the area. The duration of the works will vary from property to property, but access and egress will be maintained at all times throughout the Construction Phase.

6.12.17. I note the NTA response that suitable access to the Mullen Scrap (Dawnlane) property will be retained both during the works for the Proposed Scheme, and after those works are completed. From a review of the GNI Assets Alterations and Proposed Works, Fencing and Boundary Treatment, Landscape and Urban Realm and General Arrangement Drawings submitted. Also a review of 'Bridges and Major Retaining Structures' Appendix B18, it is clear that the access to No. 29 to 32 will be altered, however, access will be maintained. Opposition to the effects of this alteration, a separate access not maintained, is noted. However, I am satisfied that there is a need for the upgrade works at Rober Emmet Bridge that alternative options have been explored and that impact upon the businesses at this location has been justified in the common good and access will be maintained. Future development potential is outside of the remit of this assessment. I consider that there is sufficient information on file for an informed decision to be made and that further information is not necessary. I highlight that this report should be read in conjunction with the CPO report 317682-23 which accompanies this report.

### **6.13. Bus Gates & Larkview Football Club**

- 6.13.1. Concern is raised that the Bus Gate at the junction of Kimmage Road Lower and Ravensdale Park will impede access for members of the club from the south between 6pm and 8pm when training takes place. Concern is also expressed of impact upon juvenile teams and access to the club. It is submitted that impact upon club will not be sustainable and it is requested that the Bus Gate be relocated north of the club.
- 6.13.2. Issues raised in respect of bus gates is addressed throughout this report. The proposed scheme is somewhat unusual in that there will be 3 bus gates along

Kimmage Road Lower that will operate in combination with each other. Four Bus Gates are proposed in total to ensure bus priority, as follows:

**Bus Gate No.1:** On R817 Kimmage Road Lower, just north of the Ravensdale Park Junction. This Bus Gate will operate - 6am to 10am and 4pm to 8pm, 7 days a week in both northbound and southbound direction.

**Bus Gate No.2A:** On R817 Kimmage Road Lower, just south of Harold's Cross Park. This Bus Gate will operate – 24 hours, in both directions, 7 days a week.

**Bus Gate No.2B:** On R817 Kimmage Road Lower, at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park. This Bus Gate will operate – 6am to 10am in a northbound direction, 7 days a week and south bound on a 24-hour basis / 7-days a week and

**Bus Gate No.3:** On the R137 at the Harold's Cross Road and Kenilworth Park Junction. This Bus Gate will operate on a 24-hour / 7-day basis in a west bound direction only.

\*Inspectors Note. The Bus Gates are numbered differently in the application documentation and Bus Gate 3 above is also referred to as Bus Gate 4 and 2 A referred to as 3, this is note. The Bus Gate locations are described in detail and clearly delineated on the general arrangement drawings submitted.

- 6.13.3. The principal Bus Gate No.2A just south of Harold's Cross Park will provide the main control of general traffic to provide bus priority and low-flow traffic conditions for cyclists to share the road with a small amount of local traffic over a 2km length of the route. This bus gate will operate on a full-time basis, along with Bus Gate No.2B in the southbound direction. In this context, and to enable appropriate access for local traffic it is proposed that Bus Gate No.1 will operate during peak hours only. This will provide a balance between the desirable bus priority and the degree of traffic displacement onto other local roads. Similarly, Bus Gate No.2B will operate during

peak hours only in the northbound direction so as to accommodate funeral traffic leaving from Mount Jerome Cemetery and to spread that traffic more evenly on the streets surrounding Harold's Cross Park. Because of the proposed bus gates and their extensive operational hours the traffic environment along Kimmage Road Lower will be transformed into a "Low-Flow & Slow" context where cyclists can safely and comfortably share the road with a low volume of local access traffic, in accordance with the requirements of the Cycle Design Manual. It is submitted by the NTA that in this context it is not necessary to provide segregated cycling facilities.

- 6.13.4. In the Proposed Scheme the existing part-time cycle lanes that operate in the peak periods inbound in the morning and outbound in the evening will be mostly retained. However, if the bus gates were only to operate at peak periods on weekdays, then the traffic conditions for cyclists would not suit shared use of the road and segregated cycle tracks would be necessary, which would require widening into gardens along almost the full 2km length of Kimmage Road Lower.
- 6.13.5. In consideration of the foregoing, the substantial justification and need for the scheme, traffic modelling, project design and alternatives considered, as stated throughout this report, I am satisfied with the overall level of priority afforded to buses along the route. The figures presented in the EIAR show that the Proposed Scheme will have beneficial impacts in terms of time savings and reliability for bus services. It is essential on all BusConnects corridors that the bus service is given priority. DCC have carried out modelling work to mimic the real-life operation of the project. I acknowledge that the design of this scheme is difficult and complex and has called for multiple interventions along the road network in order to achieve its objectives. The use of bus priority signals, bus gates and a combination of one-way systems and turn bans are all intended to alter the current traffic situation along the route and ensure that public transport, walking and cycling can be prioritised over the private

car. Any "Watering down" of the benefits of the scheme by making localised changes to the design is not recommended. I note that contrary to the opinion that bus gate hours should be shortened, relocated or removed some submissions consider BusGates should operate 24/7, or at least be extended to cover school closure times in the afternoons.

- 6.13.6. In relation to the safety of cycling for children to the football club, the proposed bus gates and lower speed limit will transform Kimmage Road Lower into a low-flow and slow street that is perfectly suitable for all cyclists to share the road with a small volume of local traffic. In this context I agree that it should be hoped that fewer families will drive their children to the club and that more will cycle.

#### **6.14. The Wine Pair**

- 6.14.1. Several submissions express concern with regard to the temporary impacts of the proposed Construction Compound K3, located on parts of a small public plaza area on Clanbrassil Street Lower, on an existing part-grass / part-paved public space area fronting St. Patrick's Court / Greenville Place. Concern is also raised to proposals for tree planting as part of an upgrade to the urban realm after the compound is removed. The Wine Pair Business which operates from a ground floor unit of the adjoining block facing Clanbrassil Street Lower is concerned that the construction compound will impact business and impede visibility and access. The proposed construction compound K3 is described in the EIAR Volume 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.7. It has a total area of approximately 170m<sup>2</sup>. This matter is related to and should be read in conjunction with the assessment of construction compound K3 as discussed earlier in this report under 'Issues Raised'.
- 6.14.2. I note that the use and facilities proposed on Construction Compound K3 is described earlier in this report. The Construction Compounds will be fenced off, lit

(during working hours) and secured with CCTV. Temporary lighting, including security lighting will be required at the Construction Compounds. Access to the Construction Compounds will be restricted to site personnel and authorised visitors only. The Construction Compounds will be engineered with appropriate services. Water, wastewater, power, and communications connections will be organised by the appointed contractor. At work areas along the Proposed Scheme, where permanent provisions (for the duration of the construction programme) are not practicable, appropriate temporary provisions will be made, including the use of generators if required. Temporary welfare facilities will need to be used, for example, portable toilets in the vicinity of works. Wastewater from temporary welfare facilities will be collected and disposed of to a suitably licenced facility.

- 6.14.3. The EIAR acknowledges that construction works will be wide-ranging along the road corridor and will result in substantial alterations to the existing streetscape character. It is submitted that the construction works will not alter the existing townscape character along this section of the Proposed Scheme, but the presence of construction activity will have an impact on streetscape. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is assessed as medium. The potential townscape / streetscape effect of the Construction Phase is assessed to be Negative, Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.
- 6.14.4. Following completion of the construction works, the Construction Compound areas will be cleared and reinstated to match pre-existing conditions.
- 6.14.5. A response to construction compound K3 is set out in section 6.11.20 of this report above. It addresses concerns of loss of business and access issues generally along the route. I tend to agree with the NTA's response that with the proposed mitigation measures and the temporary duration of the construction compound (K3), it is unlikely that there will be a loss of business that could cause the owners to seek to

relocate to another premises. While I have due consideration to the impact the works and the location of construction compound K3 will have on the Wine Pair business, I consider it will be a temporary disruption. I highlight that the two existing main access pathways to the businesses on the western side of St. Patrick's Court from the east and north will remain open at all times so that the accessibility of the businesses is not impeded. Local arrangements will be made on a case-by-case basis to maintain continued access to the businesses, at all times. Details regarding temporary access provisions will be discussed with business owners prior to construction starting in the area. The NTA are clear that access and egress will be maintained at all times. In addition, the appointed contractor will be required to put in place a Communications Plan in accordance with the NTA's requirements to inform the public (and affected properties) in advance of construction works of a disruptive nature. To compensate for reduced visibility of the businesses caused by temporary buildings in the construction compound, temporary signage will be provided beside the main footpath along the road edge. There is an existing loading bay a short distance to the north which will remain operational at all times during the construction period. Therefore, loading to the businesses will not be restricted at any stage. The loss of the small green space will be only be short-term, and it will be reinstated enhanced by planting to improve the amenity for long-term benefit to the local community and businesses.

- 6.14.6. With respect to the concern that tree planting will be inappropriately located outside of bedroom windows at 44 Greenville Place, Clanbrassil Street. I consider this matter can be addressed by way of condition and compliance. I recommend that a condition should be attached to any grant of planning permission requiring that prior to the replacement of trees, hedging and planting which is to be removed the National Transport Authority shall liaise with the relevant landowner with regard to the species, size and location of all replacement vegetation. Tree protection measures for all existing trees shall be put in place prior to commencement of development or

phases of development and all details of soft landscaping shall be submitted to the planning authority for agreement prior to implementation. The National Transport Authority shall also employ the services of an appropriately qualified arboriculturist and Landscape Architect to advise on landscaping and tree works. While I note that it is not proposed to remove trees or vegetation at this location, the input of a qualified arboriculturist and Landscape Architect will be involved in all of the new tree planting and landscaping.

6.14.7. I note a submission suggests an alternative location for the construction compound (K3) to be relocated to St. Vincent's Street car-park a short distance to the south and on the eastern side of the street. The NTA are not in favour of this proposal, given it would result in a reduction in on-street parking along Clanbrassil Street Lower. If the construction compound were to be located at the small St. Vincent's Street car-park that would further reduce the amount of public parking in the area to serve the local businesses, which would be undesirable compared to the proposed location where no parking impact would arise. I consider that there is merit to the response and given the temporary nature of the disruption and access and egress being maintained that the proposed location of K3 is acceptable in principle. As stated above, ultimately, they are a necessary requirement and the temporary nature and location is justified, with mitigation.

#### **6.15. Thom's Pharmacy and Opticians, 151 KRL**

6.15.1. Concern of restricted access for customers and deliveries, due to bus gate on KRL. Concern of impact upon vulnerable clientele of the pharmacy. It is contended that a lot of patients have mobility issues and arrive by private car. Car parking further up the street is constantly full and will not meet demand. Concern of how deliveries will be made to vulnerable patients.



6.15.2. The concerns raised are noted, however, I consider that the response and assessment, set out above in relation to Bus Gates & Larkview Football Club is relevant here. I note that the NTA response sets out that the existing layout at this location was recently modified by Dublin City Council to extend the footpath with the removal of a small parking area. NTA understands that this parking is of particular use for customers of Thom's Pharmacy a short distance to the north, which is why it is shown to be retained in the Proposed Scheme. I note the three proposed car parking spaces located on the western side of the street outside No. 161 – 163 Kimmage Road Lower a short distance from Thom's pharmacy. I consider the response acceptable.

## **6.16. Bus Stops**

6.16.1. The provision of bus stops throughout the scheme is critical to its overall successful function. Concerns have been raised in relation to the loss of bus stops, revised locations, safety and design of the bus stop infrastructure proposed. I highlight in particular:

- The Conservation section of DCC recommends the omission of bus shelters in front of and in the immediate vicinity of Protected Structures across the route. It is submitted that bus stops, only, rather than bus shelters would be preferable in Conservation Areas. It is submitted that the vistas and settings of Protected Structures are also impacted by the proposed siting of bus shelters in their vicinity.
- DCC request that by condition, full details of the design and type of each bus shelter for each location shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development

- The Architects Department of DCC submit that bus shelters impact on the width of footpaths and should only be proposed where there is sufficient space to physically accommodate them and passengers congregating in their vicinity. It is unclear if there is sufficient width to the footpaths in some locations where bus shelters are proposed e.g. the proposed south bound bus stop and bus shelter on Harold's Cross Rd to the west side of Harold's Cross Park, {General arrangement Drg. Sheet 06), and the proposed north bound bus stop and bus shelter on Clanbrassil St Upper, (General arrangement Drg. Sheet 08).
- The submission from LKR Residents Association (LOKRA) and a number of other submissions, welcome the upgrades for bus stops but query practicality of providing shelters and seating at all bus stops. Numerous concerns are expressed with regard to bus stops 2440 (Aideen Ave), 2391 (Priory Road) and 2390 (Kenilworth Park) on narrow sections of path.
- Estrella Vaquero, 44 Clanbrassil Street has raised a concern with respect to the proposed location of bus stop No. 1290 placed some 2.7m from the front door / entrance of 44 Clanbrassil Street.

6.16.2. In relation to the location of bus stops, I note that the overall approach has been to ensure that they are located close to local facilities, have an approximate spacing of 400m (suburban) and 250m (urban centres), be close to the nearest junction/pedestrian crossing, be located downstream of a junction rather than upstream, have sufficient space for associated infrastructure (shelter, waiting area, Real Time Passenger Information [RTPI] displays, boarding and waiting areas, cycle tracks and footpaths etc.), and consider the potential for interchanges with other transport routes. In general, in relation to the location of bus, stops I am satisfied that the above approach has been adopted insofar as is practicable, however, having regard to the nature of the development of any urban project such as that proposed

there is a need to consider the locations of existing bus stops, characteristics of the various locations and constraints that are in place along the route that may necessitate a deviation from the preferred approach. The rationalisation of bus stops has led to some stops being retained, others removed, and some being omitted.

- 6.16.3. I note that the NTA response to submissions sets out that as part of the design of the Proposed Scheme a detailed review of bus stop locations was undertaken as set out in Bus Stop Review Analysis in Appendix H of the Preliminary Design Report provided as Supplementary Information. Section 11 of the Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet (PDGB) within Chapter 4 Proposed Scheme Description Appendix A4.1 of Volume 4 of the EIA sets out the key measures to address the concerns raised in relation to vulnerable users at these locations. These details have evolved as a result of direct consultation between the NTA and representative mobility groups, accessibility audits and road safety audits which have been carried out during the development of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.16.4. The proposed bus stop layout and strategy is set out in the EIA section of this report under 'Roads and Traffic, hence, I do not intend to repeat it here. In relation to the location of bus stops, at Aideen Avenue, Priory Road, Kenilworth Park, south bound on the west side of Harolds Cross Road and north bound on Clanbrassil Street Upper due to narrowness of footpaths. I note the NTA's response that the proposed scheme consists mainly of modifications to the traffic layout along existing streets and roads. The existing footpaths are largely unaffected in the scheme proposals, and it was a key consideration not to reduce the existing footpath widths unless absolutely necessary. The existing footpath widths within the proposed scheme are generally more than satisfactory for the pedestrian traffic, which varies considerably along the various streets and roads.

6.16.5. Three types of bus stop designs are set out in the PDGB, Island Bus Stops, Shared Bus Stop Landing Zone and Layby Bus Stops. Where space constraints do not allow for an island bus stop, which is the preferred bus stop type, an option consisting of a shared bus stop landing zone is used. The key design features and considerations relating to shared bus stops are:

- Conflict between cyclists and stopping buses is removed by ramping cyclists up to footpath level where they continue through the stop.
- To address the pedestrian/cyclist conflict, the cycle track should be narrowed on approach to the bus stop and yellow bar markings should be provided to alert cyclists to the potential conflict ahead. In addition to this, at the bus stop, the cycle track should be deflected to provide a 1.0m wide boarding/alighting zone for bus passengers.
- Appropriate tactile kerbing should be provided to ensure that visually impaired users are aware of crossing areas.

6.16.6. Overall, 12 of the 23 bus stops will have island bus stops. The cantilever bus shelter is designed to be used where footpaths are narrow, as will be the case at several bus stops along Kimmage Road Lower, incl. at Aideen Avenue, Priory Road and Kenilworth Park.

6.16.7. In the proposed scheme the northbound bus lane along Clanbrassil Street Lower has been omitted along this section as can be seen in general arrangement Drg. Sheet No. 09. The cycle tracks will be reduced to 1.5m wide through this narrow section of street so as to fit in the limited space available between the existing kerbs, which will be retained. On this section of the proposed scheme all of the cross-section elements are at the minimum widths provided for under the relevant design standards, which is necessary due to the narrow width of the street. With respect to

the proximity and impact of the proposed bus stop to the entrance to 44 Clanbrassil Street Upper, I note the NTA's response that Bus Stop 1290 will be moved 5m north of the existing location to where the footpath is slightly wider, and a narrow boarding island can be accommodated outside the proposed cycle track. I consider the location and impact is an acceptable one, given the urban location and justification for bus stop locations set out in the detailed review of bus stop locations undertaken, as stated above, in the Bus Stop Review Analysis. The proposed north bound bus stop to the front of No. 46 Clandrassil Street does not include a shelter, I note the frontages of the buildings to the east side of Clanbrassil Street are set back behind the proposed footpath and cycle path. I consider moving the bus stop 5 m to where the footpath is wider is preferable. The location of the bus stop, is further away from No. 44 in excess of 5m from its frontage, in terms of this being a bus stop, in an urban location, with continuous extensive entrances adjoining the carriageway, it is in my opinion justified. The location of each bus shelter / stop are shown on the General Arrangement Drawings in Volume 3 of the EIAR. Details on the design of these bus stops are outlined in Section 4.6.4.5 of Chapter 4 (Proposed Scheme Description) in Volume 2 of the EIAR.

- 6.16.8. Chapter 16 (Architectural Heritage) in Volume 2 of the EIAR considers and assesses the location of bus shelters / stops in proximity to Protected Structures and structures on the NIAH. It concludes that the potential effects of bus shelters on Protected Structures is considered to be Indirect, Negative, Slight and Long-Term. Section 4.13.6 of the Preliminary Design Report, included in the Supplementary Information outlines the requirement for Bus Shelters as part of the Proposed Scheme as follows: "Bus shelters provide an important function in design of bus stops. The shelter will offer protection for people from poor weather, with lighting to help them feel more secure. Seating will be provided to assist ambulant disabled and older passengers and accompanied with Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) signage to provide

information on the bus services.” As such, bus shelters have been provided where practicable as part of the Proposed Scheme. The proposed bus stop shelters, as shown in the Preliminary Design Guidance Booklet for BusConnects, are of a high-quality design, constructed largely of glass panels with slimline stainless-steel frames. They are discreet and highly transparent so as to have minimal visual impact on their surroundings. I note that this type of bus shelter is widely used across Dublin and are already in place beside protected structures and in conservation areas. In this regard I agree with the NTA that contrary to the DCC submission potential negative impacts will not arise.

6.16.9. With respect to a reduction in the number of Bus stops generally the NTA have responded by setting out the overall objectives of the proposed scheme relating to enhancing capacity of the public transport system and enhancing safe infrastructure for cycling are underpinned by the central concept and design philosophy of ‘People Movement’. It is submitted that the bus priority infrastructure improvements and indeed the level of protection it will provide to bus journey time consistency and reliability will provide a significant level of resilience for bus services that will use the proposed scheme from implementation into the future. The resilience provided will allow the service pattern and frequency of bus services to be increased into the future to accommodate additional demand without having a significant negative impact on bus journey time reliability or the operation of cycle and pedestrian facilities.

6.16.10. As stated previously, the preferred bus stop arrangement is the island bus stop. Where space constraints do not allow for the island bus stop arrangement to be provided, an alternative share bus stop landing zone arrangement has been provided. While some concerns have been raised by third parties in relation to the safety of the bus stop designs due to the potential for conflicts between cyclists and

bus users, I am satisfied that the measures proposed, which include deflection of cyclists behind the bus stop, narrowing of the cycle track, LED warning studs, the inclusion of speed controls including ramping the cycle track up, cycle track road markings as well as pedestrian push button controls for cycle signalling (island bus stops) all combine to maximise pedestrian and cyclist safety. I also note that the design of bus stops has been informed by carrying out traffic safety and accessibility audits to ensure safety for all users and that vulnerable users of services (including wheelchair users) are adequately protected. I am also satisfied that provisions have been made for the visually impaired through the use of tactile paving and the provision of signal call buttons for crossing cycle tracks to provide a safe and accessible environment. On review of the detailed design of the proposed bus stops, I am satisfied that the applicant has had regard to the requirements of the mobility and visually impaired and that the bus stops have taken adequate and appropriate measures to ensure accessibility and safety for all users, including cyclists, bus passengers and pedestrians.

6.16.11. Overall, having assessed their location and siting along this constrained urban route, I am satisfied that subject to a condition being attached to any grant of planning permission requiring, full details of the design and type of each bus shelter for each location to be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development, that the location of bus stops along both the inbound and outbound sections of the route are acceptable in principle. I am satisfied that the competent authority in this case the NTA will ensure that issues arising will be satisfactorily resolved by way of design. I am also satisfied that the location of the bus stops is appropriate and acceptable to provide for the needs of the local population and wider travelling public.

## **6.17. Pedestrian footpath widths and Public Realm**

- 6.17.1. Issues raised with respect to Public Realm have been discussed earlier in this report, see paragraph 6.9.28. I further note that several submissions welcome improvement to public realm along the scheme, in particular, at the junction of Sundrive Road with Lower Kimmage Road and at the junction of Ravensdale Park with Lower Kimmage Road. However, as set out above, a number of other submissions note that the proposal does not include enough improvements to the public realm at Sundrive Road, Harold's Cross Village, Kimmage Road Lower. It is requested that public seating and enhanced planting be provided at Harolds Cross Bridge area – Robert Emmet Bridge – Grand Canal. Concern is also expressed with respect to loss of trees on the east side of Harolds Cross Road. It is requested that street tree planting is augmented rather than diminished. A number of submissions request that the existing footpath to south side of Harolds Cross Park opposite 174 and 194 Harolds Cross Road, at the exit, should be retained and enhanced. I note the Roads Department of DCC submits there are concerns regarding the removal of the footpath along the southern boundary of Harold's Cross Park and the absence of crossing facilities for pedestrians to link to the opposite footpath. It is proposed that the footpath ends abruptly. However, pedestrians are not directed to a crossing point which would allow them to safely access the southern opposite footpath.
- 6.17.2. The NTA's response notes the support for the scheme from a public realm perspective. It is highlighted that as part of the proposed public realm improvements in Kimmage Village the overhead cables will be diverted underground. Elsewhere along Kimmage Road Lower there is no change proposed to the overhead cables as the existing footpaths will be retained.
- 6.17.3. Public realm improvements are proposed at the focal point near the southern end of Kimmage Road Lower where there is a cluster of shops at the Corrib Road junction.



In the middle of the road a 2m wide median island will be provided on which 14 new street trees will be planted. The proposed median island will have a traffic calming effect to assist with compliance with the proposed 30 km/h speed limit. The new trees will greatly enhance the street landscape with a significant greening effect in an area with few existing street trees. I acknowledge it is an objective to ensure that the public realm is carefully considered in the design and development of the transport infrastructure and seeks to enhance key urban focal points where appropriate and feasible. The issue raised with respect to planters instead of bollards at the road closure of Derravaragh Road / Neagh Road and the inclusion of a raised platform which would operate as a “courtesy crossing”, has been dealt with above under ‘Issues Raised’. I reiterate that I consider such matters can be dealt with by way of condition.

- 6.17.4. In respect of removal of a footpath at the southern end of Harold’s Cross Park, as shown in General arrangement Drg. Sheet No. 6. I note this short link street will be widened on the northern side to accommodate two-way traffic properly, alongside the retention of existing on-street parking for the houses on the southern side. The widening will require removal of the existing footpath along the northern side of the road adjacent to the park. As already stated above the alternative option of removing the existing parking on the southern side of the street was dismissed. This section of street carries a very small flow of traffic at present, but that will increase slightly due to the proposed bus gate on Kimmage Road Lower at the northern end of the park, which will divert local access traffic around the southern end of the park towards Mount Jerome Cemetery, Mount Argus Road and homes opposite the western side of the park. I consider that justification for the widened road and removal of footpath is justified. With mitigation and appropriate conditions to protect trees I see no concern for impact upon Harolds Cross Park.

6.17.5. It is acknowledged that the scope for public realm in Kimmage Village was explored through the various non-statutory public consultations. The NTA submit that early proposals considered the possibilities along the western side of Kimmage Road Lower where there is a row of shops and businesses extending southwards from the junction with Sundrive Road. However, this area is private property behind the 2m wide public footpath and any public realm works would require the agreement of the property owners which was not forthcoming. I agree that the scheme as proposed will provide a welcome improvement of the public realm in Kimmage Village within the extents of the public road areas over a length of 200m along Kimmage Road Lower in the north-south direction, and for 100m in the east-west direction from Larkfield Avenue along Sundrive Road to Kimmage Shopping Centre. I agree that the public realm improvements in Kimmage Village will improve the amenity of the village for the local community.

6.17.6. DCC Roads Division suggest that the scheme should seek to ensure sufficient and appropriate footpath widths of minimum 2m and seek to improve pedestrian connectivity to bus stops and ensure pedestrian priority for people with accessibility issues incl. visual impairments. DCC request by condition, confirmation that pedestrian traffic counts have been undertaken to ensure that footpath widths along the Proposed Scheme are sufficient to cater for anticipated pedestrian volumes. Concern is expressed by third parties that pedestrian safety and priority is ensured, particularly in the context of people with accessibility issues including visual impairments. Pedestrians should be ensured priority through design, signage and other appropriate measures. Residents are concerned that the proposal does not comply with minimum standards (for road width and footpath widths), DMURS Guidelines and objectives.

6.17.7. The NTA confirms that pedestrian counts have been undertaken along the route of the Proposed Scheme. Chapter 6 of the EIAR outlines a Level of Service (LoS) assessment carried out in respect of pedestrian facilities. Section 6.4.6.3 of Chapter 6 notes the following in relation to the assessment of pedestrian infrastructure:

“Pedestrian Infrastructure: The Proposed Scheme consists of measures to enhance the existing pedestrian infrastructure along the direct study area. A Level of Service (LoS) junction assessment was undertaken using a set of five criteria to determine the impact that the Proposed Scheme has for pedestrians. The results of the impacted junctions demonstrate that the LoS during the Do Minimum scenario consists predominantly of the lowest D / E / F ratings in the west of the scheme, with mostly C rating closer to the city centre. During the Do Something scenario, i.e. following the development of the Proposed Scheme, the LoS consists predominantly of the highest A / B ratings, with the exception of one C. Overall, the improvements to the quality of the pedestrian infrastructure will be Positive, Moderate to Significant and Long-Term in Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme.”

6.17.8. Segregated cycle track widths and pedestrian paths throughout the Proposed Scheme are generally 2m wide, although at certain locations these widths are proposed to be reduced to account for local constraints. In all instances reductions from the preferred widths are over short distances and are being provided to either tie in with existing adjoining facilities, to reduce land take requirements on private property, minimise impacts on items of heritage interest, or retain existing mature trees/planting. I note that the reductions can result in the cycle track widths falling to a minimum of 1.2m for certain specific pinch points over short sections and that a minimum of 1.2m (accessibility standard) is maintained for pinch points on footpaths at all locations. Having regard to the context and nature of the Proposed Scheme, I consider these deviations to be acceptable and note that footpaths will continue to

meet accessibility standards throughout. DMURS defines the absolute minimum footway width for road sections as 1.8m based on the width required for two wheelchairs to pass each other. At specific pinch points, Building for Everyone: A Universal Design Approach, defines acceptable minimum footpath widths as being 1.2m wide over a 2m length of path. This minimum of 1.2m allows one wheelchair to pass.

6.17.9. On balance, it is clear in my opinion, that the scheme provides an appropriate balance between meeting objectives while minimising the impact on the receiving environment. I highlight that a large number of submissions and the City Council welcomes in principle the objectives of the scheme to support integrated sustainable transport use through infrastructure improvements for active travel (both walking and cycling), and the provision of enhanced bus priority measures. The Proposed Scheme will facilitate the modal shift from car dependency through the provision of walking, cycle, and bus infrastructure enhancements thereby contributing to an efficient, integrated transport system and facilitating a shift to a low carbon and climate resilient city. I note it is the intention of the NTA to further liaise with the City Council internal departments in relation to the final detailing of new street furniture.

6.17.10. Overall, it is anticipated that there will be Positive, Significant and Long-Term effect to the quality of the pedestrian infrastructure along Section 1, 2 and 3 of the Proposed Scheme during the Operational Phase, which aligns with the overarching aim to provide enhanced walking infrastructure on the corridor. This is despite the loss of a short section of footway along the southern side of Harold's Cross Park due to the already well used alternatives. The proposed scheme will result in the provision of new / refurbished pedestrian facilities and footpaths along the scheme and associated ancillary works. The number of pedestrian signal crossings will increase from 35 to 47. The scheme provides for the provision of 12 junction

upgrades and provision of 29 new / refurbished raised table side entry facilities. I consider the public realm upgrades, including: two new footbridges over the Grand Canal in Portobello, a new pedestrian/cyclist boardwalk structure over the River Poddle in Kimmage between Sundrive Road and Mount Argus Way, a widened footpaths and high quality hard and soft landscaping contribute towards a safer, more attractive environment for pedestrians. From the General Arrangement Drawings, Landscape and Urban Realm and Photomontages I am satisfied that the scheme has been designed having regard to relevant accessibility guidance and universal design principles so as to provide access for all users. I am also satisfied that the changes in streetscape elements, including replacement / new street trees, the re-allocation of carriageway space, parking, provision of cycle and footpath facilities, signage, lighting, surfacing, road markings, etc. is a marked improvement on existing public realm.

#### **6.18. Provision for Cyclists**

- 6.18.1. The impacts to the quality of the cycling infrastructure as a result of the proposed scheme have been considered with reference to the changes in physical provision for cyclists provided during the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios. The NTA's National Cycle Manual (NTA 2011) Quality of Service (QoS) Evaluation criteria have been adapted for use in assessing the cycling qualitative impact along the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.18.2. The proposed scheme will provide 8.0 km (total both directions) of cycling infrastructure and facilities. A secondary cycle route is designated, running parallel to Kimmage Road Lower, along Poddle Park, Bangor Road, and Blarney Park to Sundrive Road. From Sundrive Road, a new cycle connection to Mount Argus Way

and Mount Argus View is proposed where a steel boardwalk structure is proposed beside the River Poddle at the Stone Boat feature.

- 6.18.3. From Harold's Cross Road and Harold's Cross Park the route proceeds towards the Grand Canal at Robert Emmet Bridge for a distance of 400 metres. Priority for buses will be provided along the entire length of this section, with retention and minor extension of the existing dedicated bus lanes along Harold's Cross Road. New segregated 1.5m wide cycle tracks are proposed in both directions along Harold's Cross Road.
- 6.18.4. At the Grand Canal the route proceeds from Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal on Clanbrassil Street Upper and through to the Leonard's Corner Junction at South Circular Road, and then along Clanbrassil Street Lower and New Street South, until it reaches the junction with Kevin Street Upper and Patrick Street. At Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal, two new cycle/ pedestrian bridge structures are proposed on either side of the existing arch bridge to provide footpaths and the northbound cycle track outside of the narrow bridge width. Priority for buses will be provided. New segregated cycle tracks will be provided in both directions along the full length of this section of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.18.5. The route will see a substantial improvement to provision for cyclists across Robert Emmet Bridge. The current 1.5m advisory cycle lanes will be replaced with a 4m wide track on the western side with a separate lane providing significant right turning capacity into Windsor Terrace. Additionally, a segregated cycle track will be provided for southbound traffic on the eastern side.
- 6.18.6. The Level of service (LoS) ratings of the cycling facilities during the Do Minimum scenario for all three links of Sections 1,2 & 3 are equal to C (bicycle share traffic or bus lanes). During the Do Something scenario the LoS ratings increase to either an A (Well separated at mid-link with some conflict at intersections / High degree of

separation. Minimal delay) a B (On-road cycle lanes or carriageway designated as 'quiet cycle routes') or a C (Bicycle share traffic or bus lanes), with only a small portion of the route with a D rating (No specific bicycle facilities). The improvement in LoS rating is as a result of improved segregation for cyclists and junction treatment in the form of cycle lanes traversing priority junctions and continuing through signalised junctions with protected treatment as part of the Proposed Scheme. The findings of the cycling assessment fully aligns with the objective of the CBC Infrastructure Works, applicable to the Traffic and Transport assessment of the Proposed Scheme, to 'Enhance the potential for cycling by providing safe infrastructure for cycling, segregated from general traffic wherever practicable'. A detailed breakdown of the assessment along each section can be found in Appendix A6.4 - Appendix A6.4.2 (Cycling Infrastructure Assessment) in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

- 6.18.7. I note at the R817 Kimmage Road Lower: Ravensdale Park to Sundrive Road - Cycle lanes are provided in both directions for the majority of the link, however no cycle infrastructure is provided in both directions to the west of Sundrive Road for over a 100m, and no westbound cycle infrastructure is provided for approx. 50m to the west of Kimmage Court.
- 6.18.8. The Traffic Section of DCC is supportive of the integrated sustainable transport proposals and recognise the significant improvements that they will bring in terms of safe cycling measures and in enabling an efficient public transportation service along the route. DCC is committed to assisting the NTA and their agents in delivering the proposed scheme. Further the NTA is committed to engaging with the Traffic and Transport Department of Dublin City Council to address any concerns they may have about details of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.18.9. DCC Traffic and Transport Section have submitted an assessment of the proposed scheme highlighting areas of concern and support for numerous improvements to

cycling infrastructure along the route. I note issues raised for further consideration by DCC in respect of the proposed cycle routes through Poddle Park and Mount Argus Park. The NTA's response clarifies that this element of the submission relates to superseded proposals that had been included in an earlier stage of the Proposed Scheme. Following the non-statutory public consultations and submissions received with concerns about intrusions into these two small public parks, the scheme design was adjusted to omit those aspects, and the cycle routes were revised. The additional submission by DCC in response to the NTA's response acknowledges this.

6.18.10. In response to the DCC Conservation Section request for an alternative high quality cycle lane surface in-lieu of red tarmac, the NTA response that this is impractical in a city where this would require a change of the cycle track surfacing at numerous places, is accepted. I agree it is questionable if worthwhile benefit would derive. I accept the NTA's response that to locally modify the cycle track surface would be inconsistent, and it would diminish the effectiveness of distinguishing that part of the road visually to increase awareness of vehicle drivers of the need to safeguard the road space allocated to cyclists for safety reasons.

6.18.11. The NTA acknowledge that due to significant constraints in available width along the route, that in some locations, cycle facilities of a narrower width than the desirable minimum of 2.0m have been proposed. Typical cross-sections are provided within Appendix B4 of the PDR which detail the proposed cycle track widths. The options selection process which has informed the design of the Proposed Scheme in each location is document in the Preferred Route Options Report, which is included in the Supplementary Information of the submission.

6.18.12. It is acknowledged that the design of this scheme is complex. Considering the constraints at a number of locations, I am satisfied that conflicts raised by DCC between pedestrians and cyclists have been considered, responded to satisfactorily



and / or designed in / out of the Proposed Scheme, where appropriate, to the best possible extent. I note that the NTA has no objection to liaising further with DCC with respect to agreeing full details of design prior to commencement of development. In this regard I recommend that a condition be attached to any grant of planning permission requiring that, in the interest of pedestrian and cyclist safety, the developer shall agree in writing with the planning authority details of the precise design and layout of pedestrian crossing facilities over cycle tracks at island bus stops on a case-by-case basis which shall be informed by the Cycle Design Manual (National Transport Authority, September 2023)

6.18.13. The Dublin Cycling Campaign supports the proposed scheme, though they do request a few minor modifications. Concerns are raised with respect to lower quality intermittent cycle lanes on the Lower Kimmage Road, cycle track width less than 2m, adherence to universal design and continuity of cycle tracks. Dublin Cycling Campaign welcomes bus gates operational at peak times from KCR to Harolds Cross, provision of new canal bridges at Emmet Bridge, new bus stop by-passes along sections of Kimmage Road Lower, Harolds Cross Road and Clanbrassil Street, provision of segregated cycle tracks on Harolds Cross Road, addition of quiet way along the Poddle and through Mount Argus, removal of cycleway through Ravensdale Park, improved pedestrian and cycle facilities at the KCR junction and the removal of slip roads.

6.18.14. I note filtered permeability is a welcomed approach, quiet street treatment is welcomed and the role out of 30 Kph speed limits.

6.18.15. As illustrated in Appendix 1 numerous submissions have sought design changes to the proposed scheme. As set out in section 4.8 of this report above the NTA has responded in depth to issues raised. The submissions are summarised in detail in Appendix 1 of this report. I note and highlight the detailed and valid nature

of the response set out to filtered permeability, achieving national mobility policy targets, universal design, cycle track design, segregation and widths, quiet street treatments, principles of protected junction design, pedestrian – cyclist conflict, use of traffic signals to yield to cyclists and speed limits.

6.18.16. I highlight the response and rebuttal to the many design elements of the scheme, by Dublin Cycling Campaign, local businesses and various third parties and residents associations. The NTA recognises the benefit that the continued engagement with the Dublin Cycling Campaign and other advocacy groups, has had in developing the Proposed Scheme. It is notable that the Dublin Cycling Campaign are generally supportive of the scheme. I note the NTA's submission that it looks forward to the continuation of collaboration with the Dublin Cycling Campaign in achieving the scheme objectives which have many synergies with the Dublin Cycling Campaign's vision for a vibrant city where people of all ages and abilities can choose to cycle as part of their everyday life.

6.18.17. In the Proposed Scheme segregated cycle tracks will be provided along a length of 200m along Sundrive Road between the junctions with Blarney Park and Kimmage Road Lower. The proposed cycle tracks will be separated from traffic by a raised kerb which will be lowered as necessary for traffic to cross for access to driveways and parking areas. The kerb segregation will enhance safety for cyclists in the cycle tracks.

6.18.18. The proposed scheme will retain the advisory cycle lanes along Kimmage Road Lower north of the junction with Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue. Some of the traffic diverted away from Kimmage Road Lower at the bus gate introduced at Ravensdale Park will come to the Sundrive Road junction with the potential to create a somewhat hostile environment particularly for young children and vulnerable cyclists. As already stated in the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan the route

along the Stone Boat and through Mount Argus is indicated as a feeder link from Sundrive Road to the secondary route along Kimmage Road Lower that in turn connects with the primary route at Harold's Cross Road. While the feeder cycle route through Mount Argus may not be shorter than the alternative route along the main roads through Sundrive Cross, it will allow cyclists to bypass that busy junction, and will be a quieter and more attractive route for cyclists of all ages and abilities.

6.18.19. As with any new infrastructure there will be an element of acclimatisation for all users. I note that the preferred location for raised adjacent cycle tracks is between the footpath and any proposed parking spaces as this provides additional protection for cyclists and that this is also in line with international best practice. Furthermore, I note that where parking is proposed adjacent to a cycle lane a protection/separation buffer of 0.75m is incorporated (between the car parking area and the cycle track) throughout to avoid conflicts arising. I consider this approach to be acceptable and am satisfied that it provides a safe environment for cyclists as well as those existing/entering parked cars.

6.18.20. Overall, as referred to above I am satisfied that conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists have been designed out of the proposed scheme to the best possible extent. I recommend that, in the interest of pedestrian and cyclist safety, a condition be attached to any decision to grant planning permission which requires that prior to commencement of development, the developer shall agree in writing with the planning authority details of the precise design and layout of pedestrian crossing facilities over cycle tracks at island bus stops on a case-by-case basis which shall be informed by the Cycle Design Manual (National Transport Authority, September 2023).

## **6.19. Removal of parking / loading bays**

- 6.19.1. A number of submissions raised concerns about retention of car parking spaces in front of businesses, on lower Kimmage Road. Concern parking spaces are favoured over public realm improvements and pedestrians and cyclists, at 169 – 199 LKR to facilitate businesses. It is submitted this is contrary to policy and core aims of the Busconnects project.
- 6.19.2. Concern is expressed at loss of car parking and loading bays on Clanbrassil Street, in particular at 60 / 60 A Lower Clanbrassil Street and 50, 51 and 52 Upper Clanbrassil Street, at the Tesco Express shop on Lower Kimmage Road, at the Tesco Express on SCR and loss of car parking for residents at 11 – 13 Sundrive Road Junction.
- 6.19.3. Concern is also expressed by the Religious Sisters of Charity with respect to the proposal for a 22 space public car park at the entrance to Our Lady's Hospital.
- 6.19.4. A response to each of these concerns has been set out in the preceding section of this report under 'Issues Raised' and 'Impact for Businesses'. I do not intend to repeat the responses here. I also refer the Board to the assessment of 'Parking' within section 9.275 'Roads and Traffic' of this report in the EIAR section below.
- 6.19.5. I note that in Section 1 of the proposed scheme, where parking is removed, the impact varies between negligible and slight. The loss of car parking is primarily as a result of the loss of informal and Pay & Display parking at the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. The loss of car parking, the retention of car parking and the proposed new car parking spaces are considered acceptable. Overall there is a reduction of some 46 spaces, however this is considered acceptable in the context of improved accessibility to this local area (on

foot, by bicycle and bus) for residents and visitors to local shops and businesses.

The Magnitude of Impact is considered Negative, Slight and Long-Term.

6.19.6. I note that the proposed amendments to parking / loading will result in an overall increase of twelve parking spaces along Section 2. The main changes are as follows:

- There are currently 10 permit parking spaces located north of the R137 Harold's Cross Road / Clare's Avenue Junction adjacent to the northbound carriageway. It is proposed to remove the 10 spaces at this location. A new off street car park comprising 22 permit / paid parking spaces is proposed approximately 40m north of this location.
- There are seven parking spaces located north of the R137 Harold's Cross Road / Clare's Avenue Junction adjacent to the southbound carriageway. Of these, six are permit parking and one is a designated disabled parking bay. It is proposed to remove two permit parking spaces. To offset the impact of the parking reduction, new on-street permit / paid parking (four spaces) is proposed approximately 100m to the north of this location.
- It is proposed to remove two permit parking spaces located south of the Grand Canal adjacent to the R137 Harold's Cross Road southbound carriageway, to provide continuous bus and cycle facilities along the carriageway.

6.19.7. The effect is considered acceptable in the context of the planned outcome of the Proposed Scheme, which is to improve accessibility to this local area (on foot, by bicycle and bus) for residents and visitors to local shops and businesses. Cognisance is had to the provision of new car parking spaces and availability of alternative permit and Pay & Display parking on neighbouring roads. The magnitude of impact is described as Negligible and Long-term effect.

6.19.8. As shown in Table 6-32 of the EIAR proposed amendments to parking / loading will result in a loss of 19 spaces along Section 3. The main changes are as follows:

- It is proposed to remove one Pay & Display / permit parking space south of the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper / Clanbrassil Close Junction adjacent to the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper northbound carriageway.
- It is proposed to remove three Pay & Display / permit parking spaces located north of the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper / Clanbrassil Close Junction adjacent to the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper southbound carriageway.
- It is proposed to remove one Pay & Display / permit parking spaces located north of the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper / Wesley Place Junction adjacent to the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper northbound carriageway.
- It is proposed to remove all 21 Pay and Display / permit parking spaces between South Circular Road and Lombard Street West to provide continuous cycle facilities. Off-street residential parking is available to the rear of the properties, two additional parking spaces are proposed in Vincent Street car park (Bottle Bank) and five additional Pay and Display / permit spaces are proposed approximately 100m to the north.
- It is proposed to relocate one loading bay on the R137 New Street South southbound carriageway south of the R137 New Street South / Kevin Street Upper Junction (approximately 15m south of the current location).

The magnitude of impact is described as a Negligible and Long-term effect.

6.19.9. Overall, I acknowledge that there will be a total loss of 46 parking spaces along the proposed scheme. Cognisance is had to the loss of the loading bay to the front of Tesco Express on the SCR which, I determine, is not included in the 46 spaces. This loss has been dealt with in the preceding section of this report and considered

acceptable given available parking in the immediate area, to the rear of the store. Generally given the availability of equivalent types of parking along adjacent streets within 200m of these locations (and typically within under 100m), the overall impact of this loss of parking is considered acceptable. Cognisance being had to the location of the proposed development within an urban highly accessible area and that spaces are to be lost to facilitate enhanced walking, cycling and bus infrastructure, I am satisfied that the loss of spaces is justified. I am satisfied the proposed 22 space car park at Our Lady's Hospice is justified. I am also satisfied that no significant effects arise in this regard.

#### **6.20. Private Cars / Impact on commercial / Service/ Community Premises.**

- 6.20.1. Submissions have been made raising concerns that the proposed scheme will result in adverse impacts on commercial, service and community premises along the route. In this regard I consider that the proposed scheme will improve accessibility to commercial and service premises. Car parking (albeit at a reduced level) remains available at suitable locations along the route and significant infrastructure improvements are being brought about to cater for additional access by safe, convenient, and reliable sustainable modes of transport. The proposed scheme will render all businesses and services along the route more accessible to those who do not have access to a private car and additional bike stands are also provided throughout.
- 6.20.2. Some submissions have raised concerns that the Proposed Scheme will have an adverse impact on more vulnerable people in terms of impacting their ability to access medical services (such as pharmacies, doctors, and hospital visits), as such users may not be in a position to take advantage of public transport or cycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements. Concerns have also been raised in relation

to accessible car parking spaces being lost. Submissions and concerns raised by Thom's Pharmacy and Opticians, Our Lady's Hospice, Religious Sisters of Charity, Mount Jerome Cemetery and Mount Argus Church have been dealt with in the preceding section of this report under 'Issues Raised', 'Impact for Businesses' and 'Justification and Need' for the project.

- 6.20.3. It is clear that there will be positive impacts of improved accessibility by pedestrians, cyclists and bus users, and employees to access services and commercial businesses. The nature of the proposed works means accessibility impacts will differ based on the mode of travel used. The applicant has determined that people movement would significantly increase along the route as a result of improved footpaths and cycle paths. It is expected that all businesses along the proposed scheme will, to some extent, benefit from the increase in passing trade.
- 6.20.4. The NTA have determined that the bus gates are not expected to have a significant impact on private vehicles accessing commercial businesses along these stretches of roads due to the lack of on-street parking provision and that the businesses can be serviced outside of the restricted hours of the Busgates. It is acknowledged they will impact accessibility in terms of lengthened and re-routed journeys. With respect to Busgates this matter has been assessed separately above in this report. I consider that impact upon access to commercial, service and community facilities is acceptable and positive.
- 6.20.5. I note that a number of submissions are in favour of the project and argue that the proposed scheme does not go far enough, that car parking at 169 – 199 Kimmage Road Lower should be removed and that additional limitations should be put in place for general traffic. I also note that all relevant policy documentation advocates for the prioritisation of public transport over the private car as this represents the most sustainable and efficient means of moving people around any urban environment. I



consider that the scheme, as designed, successfully balances the need to prioritise public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure while also accommodating businesses and the private car within the network. I acknowledge that certain inconveniences will arise for the private car in terms of there being less carriageway space devoted/assigned to it, the removal of left turning filter lanes, the reduction in car parking spaces, and restricted turning/access at certain locations. While car parking will be reduced along the scheme, it is still retained where practicable at suitable locations. Accordingly, while acknowledging that there is a loss of car parking, I do not consider this loss to be of such significance or adverse impact to merit any changes, omission or refusal of the Proposed Scheme given the overall wider benefits arising in terms of improved bus, walking, and cycling infrastructure in terms of people movement and emissions reductions.

6.20.6. I note that DCC Traffic Division and Dublin Cycling Campaign welcome design interventions such as Bus gates. DCC is supportive of the proposal and recognises the significant improvements in terms of safe cycling measures and in enabling an efficient public transportation service along the route.

6.20.7. It is essential on all BusConnects corridors that the bus service is given priority. DCC states that links to bus information in relation to traffic flow management will be upgraded to improve this service and ensure free flow for buses. This digital improvement is necessary to ensure the scheme operates to its full potential. DCC have carried out modelling work to mimic the real-life operation of the project. It is stated that the design of this scheme is difficult and complex and has called for multiple interventions along the road network in order to achieve its objectives. The use of bus priority signals, bus gates and a combination of one-way systems and turn bans are all intended to alter the current traffic situation along the route and ensure that public transport, walking and cycling can be prioritised over the private car. Any

“Watering down” of the benefits of the scheme by making localised changes to the design is not recommended.

- 6.20.8. The Transport Impact Assessment appended to the EIAR focuses on the movement of people rather than the movement of vehicles and I have concluded in the EIA that the assessment approach is robust and appropriate for modelling the future impacts of the Proposed Scheme. I consider that the information presented in the EIAR, and associated appendices gives a good representation of existing and future people movement scenarios along the corridor for the opening year and into the future.
- 6.20.9. In general, in a ‘Do Nothing’ scenario the streetscape would continue to be based around the movement and parking requirements of private cars instead of people. I consider that the proposed bus, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure will be of a quality to encourage a modal shift away from the private car and this should satisfy what is essentially the main objective of the BusConnects programme. Given the urgency of climate change, I consider that the Proposed Scheme as presented will go a long way towards the promotion of compact growth and sustainable movement.

#### **6.21. Built Heritage/Cultural Heritage/Architectural Heritage.**

- 6.21.1. An overview of the proposed scheme is set out in section 3.0 of this report above and I do not intend to repeat the description. The local policy context in relation to natural, cultural and built heritage for Dublin City Council is set out in Section 5.24 above. Some submissions have raised concerns in relation to the potential adverse impact that the proposed scheme could have on various elements of the built heritage/cultural heritage and architectural heritage. However, concerns mainly focus upon impact to Robert Emmett Bridge and impact of the proposed Boardwalk upon the Stone Boat Feature.

6.21.2. Sections 15 & 16 of the EIAR submitted examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to Archaeology & Cultural Heritage and Architectural Heritage. The EIAR section 8.0 of this report sets out in detail the baseline conditions, impacts upon protected structures and their settings, ACA's, CA's, NIAH Structures, Street Furniture, and mitigation and potential operational phase impacts. Table 14 set out hereunder in the EIAR assessment section, of this report, sets out a summary of potential and residual effects on Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural Heritage. I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural Heritage and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR.

6.21.3. The National Monument Service (NMS) has reviewed the EIAR and is broadly in agreement with the findings in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage.

- 4 no. conditions with respect to archaeology are recommended, they relate to:
  - Mitigation measures set out in the EIAR
  - CEMP
  - Project Archaeologist to be appointed.
  - Archaeological monitoring and any investigation work / excavation required.

6.21.4. These conditions I consider are appropriate. I recommend in the event planning permission is granted such conditions be attached. The Conservation section of DCC recommends conditions to be attached to any grant of planning permission I note paragraph 9.163 of the EIAR section of this report below sets out in detail the DCC conditions. Particular concerns are raised by the Conservation Section in relation to proposed new bridges on the character of Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and the Conservation Area and repositioning of retaining walls and steps (NIAH 50080982), at Clanbrassil Street Upper on the Character of the Conservation Area. I

also note concerns raised by observers to impact upon the tongue / stone boat feature. I note in particular the following recommendations by DCC in their observations to the NTA's response:

- A redesigned scheme at Robert Emmet Bridge that is of higher architectural quality than the submitted proposal and that would lessen the physical and visual impact on the historic masonry bridge.
- The concealment/ burial of historic walls at Clanbrassil Street Upper is not appropriate.
- Request full details of the design and type and location of each bus shelter/ stop along the proposed route in front of Protected Structures and structures on the NIAH.
- The Conservation Section recommends the omission of bus shelters in front of and in the immediate vicinity of Protected Structures across the route and for bus stops only to be considered at these locations, in order to minimise visual clutter and protect the special architectural character of Protected Structures.
- Consideration should be given to the rationalisation of all traffic infrastructure such as signage, traffic poles, utility boxes etc.
- The Conservation Section recommends the omission of cantilevered signal poles in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within Conservation Areas, red hatched conservation areas and residential conservation areas and alternative traffic signalling solutions should be sought
- Consideration should be given to the omission of gantry traffic signage in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within

Architectural Conservation Areas, red hatched conservation areas and residential conservation areas and alternative traffic signage solutions should be sought.

- Where cycle ways are located in close proximity to Protected Structures and within Conservation Areas generally, the Conservation Section recommends the use of alternative high quality cycle lane surface in-lieu of red tarmacadam.
- The alignment of footpaths should respect the setting of Protected Structures and buildings of National importance.

6.21.5. I highlight the extensive Mitigation Measures proposed by the applicant, set out in detail in section 9.164 of this report, I note in particular the following:

- An experienced and competent licence-eligible archaeologist will be employed by the appointed contractor to advise on archaeological and cultural heritage matters during construction, to communicate all findings in a timely manner to the NTA and statutory authorities, to acquire any licenses/ consents required to conduct the work, and to supervise and direct the archaeological measures associated with the Proposed Scheme.
- Licence applications are made by the licence-eligible archaeologist to the National Monuments Service at the DHLGH. In addition to a detailed method statement, the applications must include a letter from the NTA that confirms the availability of adequate funding. There is a prescribed format for the letter that must be followed.
- Other consents may include a Detection Device licence to use a metal-detector or to carry out a non-invasive geophysical survey.

- A construction schedule will be made available to the archaeologist, with information on where and when the various elements and ground disturbance will take place.
- As part of the licensing requirements, it is essential for the client to provide sufficient notice to the archaeologist(s) in advance of the construction works commencing. This will allow for prompt arrival on site to undertake additional surveys and to monitor ground disturbances. As often happens, there may down time where no excavation work is taking place during the construction phase. In this case, it will be necessary to inform the archaeologist/s as to when ground-breaking works will recommence.
- In the event of archaeological features or material being uncovered during the Construction Phase, all machine work will cease in the immediate area to allow the archaeologist/s time to inspect and record any such material.
- Once the presence of archaeologically significant material is established, full archaeological recording of such material is recommended. If it is not possible for the construction works to avoid the material, full excavation will be recommended. The extent and duration of excavation will be advised by the client's archaeologist and will be a matter for discussion between the NTA and the licensing authorities.
- Secure storage for artefacts recovered during the course of the monitoring and related work will be provided by the appointed contractor.
- As part of the licensing requirement and in accordance with the funding letter, adequate funds to cover excavation, post-excavation analysis, and any testing or conservation work required will be made available.

- During the construction all machine traffic must be restricted as to avoid any newly revealed archaeological or cultural heritage sites and their environs. Materials management will be in operation to ensure no damage to a site of archaeological interest.
- Archaeological monitoring (as defined in section 15.3.5.1) under licence will take place, where any preparatory ground-breaking or ground reduction works are required at the following locations:
  - Within the designated ZAP for the Historic Dublin City Watercourse (RMP DU022-003001/002 and RMP DU018-043004), which includes the recorded millrace site (RMP DU022-003002) and mill and mill pond (RMP DU022-077001/002) and
  - At Mount Argus Way, the site of a weir (RMP DU018-043003), known locally as the 'Tongue' or the 'Stone Boat'. The design intent is to avoid any impact to the weir (RMP DU018- 043003). As a mitigation measure, all piling arisings and any ground breaking works will be archaeologically monitored in order to identify any associated below ground archaeological features or finds.
  - On Harold's Cross Road where the former line of a tramway has been identified (DCIHR 18-15- 030);
  - At Robert Emmet Bridge (or Harold's Cross Bridge) (NIAH 50080983 and DCHIR 18-15-009) and the Grand Canal where excavation will occur to accommodate the new design proposals. Excavation in the area may result in revealing features of an industrial heritage interest associated with the canal and bridge. Any ground-breaking works at this location may result in a Negative, Moderate, Permanent impact on industrial heritage remains, which survive below ground. Any resultant archaeological or industrial heritage features will be identified and recorded; and

- The setting and the configuration of the canal, bridge and streetscape will be altered as the bridge will be widened via standalone structures to the east and west of the existing structure to accommodate the additional space needed for the Proposed Scheme.
- Archaeological monitoring will take place at the early stages of construction, where any preparatory ground-breaking or ground reduction works are required (as defined in Section 15.4.1) at Construction Compounds K1 and K2. This will be undertaken in order to establish the presence or absence, as well as the nature and extent, of any archaeological deposits, features or sites that may be present in these areas. At K3 no excavation works are envisaged.
- Coal Hole covers will be recorded by an archaeologist in relation to the associated property and coal cellar. The surrounding granite setting will be recorded, noting the presence and characteristics of any channel which has been carved into the setting. The coal hole covers and associated granite settings will be removed under archaeological supervision and in accordance with a method statement agreed with the NTA and the statutory authorities. They will be reinstated as close as possible to their original location to accommodate a cycling track.
- Works to lamp posts, paving and surface treatments will also be overseen by an architectural specialist and will be carried out by the appointed contractor in accordance with the methodology provided in Appendix A.16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

6.21.6. I note the Council's concerns in relation to proposed bridges on the character of Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and the Conservation Area and repositioning of retaining walls and steps (NIAH 50080982), at Clanbrassil Street Upper on the Character of the Conservation Area. I note concerns raised with



respect to impact upon the Stone Boat feature and the entrance gates to Our Lady's Hospice, Greenmount House, Harold's Cross Road. I also note the response to the concerns raised by DCC, other prescribed bodies and the general submissions. I agree with the NTA that the works are necessary and justified. I refer the Board to the 'NTA Response to Prescribed Bodies' and 'Justification and Need' for the proposed scheme, as set out above and also the assessment of Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural Heritage, set out in the EIAR section of this report, below, I do not intend to duplicate it here. A response to the specific 'Issues Raised' set above in section 6.8 of this report is also of relevance. The works are reasonable and necessary to implement the proposed scheme. In the interest of retaining the integrity of these structures I recommend that an Architectural Heritage Specialist is employed to monitor any impact upon, the removal and replacement of such structures.

6.21.7. As concluded in the EIAR section of this report in the assessment of Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural Heritage, once the mitigation measures and appropriate conditions have been implemented, there will be no significant residual negative impacts on architectural heritage.

6.21.8. In order to be consistent with other Busconnects schemes within the Dublin area I recommend that a condition be attached to any grant of planning permission that scaled elevations of proposed bus shelters to be provided throughout the route shall be submitted for the written agreement of the relevant Planning Authority. A review of the Dublin City Development Plan (DCC 2022) indicates the study area abuts the south-eastern edge of the Thomas Street ACA. Therefore, as the route does not transverse an ACA a specific condition with respect to omission of advertisement panels on Bus Stops within an ACA is not relevant.

6.21.9. The removal and setting back of some boundaries along the route will not alter the overall character of the area or the overall appearance of any of the existing dwellings to such a degree as to warrant a refusal of the proposed scheme. Specific regard is had to Policy BHA2 of the DCCDP which relates to impact upon protected structures and their curtilages.

6.21.10. Overall, I highlight that the Proposed Scheme predominantly refers to works along and within an existing transport corridor and as such the majority of works will occur at street level to the carriageways and footpaths, with the notable exceptions of boundary treatment setbacks, signage provision, and bus shelters.

6.21.11. In general, I do not consider that the Proposed Scheme will give rise to significant adverse impacts on items of architectural heritage, the works being carried out to carriageways and at street level will not in my opinion impact the character of any of the areas through which the route extends as the nature of the route will remain consistent with that currently in place, i.e. it will remain a significant transport corridor which will facilitate vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist movements. I do note that the Proposed Scheme runs through areas that have significant heritage value in and of themselves and passes by or near structures and buildings that are of architectural or heritage merit.

6.21.12. For clarity, in relation to potential impacts on the built environment, I consider that the design of the proposed scheme has given adequate consideration to all elements of heritage value throughout the design process. I consider that the need for road widening at Robert Emmet Bridge, the proposed board walk at the Tongue / The Stone Boat feature and the construction compound K2 and car park at Our Lady's Hospice is appropriate as proposed and that it will not detract from the heritage value of structures or features in the vicinity or the wider streetscape. I am also satisfied that the approach set out in the application documentation in relation to

the treatment, preservation and reuse of heritage features (including heritage lampposts, post boxes, coal hole covers, jostle stones, cobbles, granite kerbing etc.) throughout the Proposed Scheme (as set out in the EIAR and shown on the landscaping general arrangement drawings) is appropriate.

**Inspectors Note:** \*At Robert Emmet Bridge the road will be widened by 2m and there will be full pavement reconstruction over the full road width. The new bridges will be independent of Robert Emmet Bridge. The main portion of the bridge including the lamps and memorial to Robert Emmet will be retained in-situ. The new bridges will have a direct impact on the curving end walls of Robert Emmet Bridge. The end walls on the south side and east side were built as part of the bridge. Part of the end wall on the north-west side was built in the 1930s but the northern end is part of a retaining wall (NIAH 50080982) built in the 1790s. Their removal will represent a loss of historic fabric. The decks of the proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges will be supported on piles located beside the north and south tow paths of the Grand Canal on either side of the existing bridge.

\* The retaining walls on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080982) are also partly located within the Grand Canal Conservation Area and are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The proposed land take and road widening to accommodate the northbound bus corridor, a cycle track and footpath on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper will result in the burial or removal of two cut limestone retaining walls on the west side of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper. The walls and steps are part of a group of three walls which were built in 1790 and form part of an integrated group with Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and the Grand Canal (CBC0011BTH042). The two walls will be replaced by a new modern wall with masonry facing and there will be a long-term impact on the character of R137

Clanbrassil Street Upper which will be visibly wider and also on the character of the Conservation Area.

\* That the proposed boardwalk at the Stone Boat feature will have a perforated deck allowing for visibility of the site of the weir as well as interpretative signage at either end of the boardwalk.

\* It is predicted that only one of the 104 protected structures identified in the study area will be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme. Land acquisition is proposed to the north of the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice. The land take will directly affect the rusticated granite north pier of the main entrance gates to the Hospice. The piers are protected structures of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity, as they are part of the curtilage of the Hospice. This land take will necessitate the removal and repositioning of the pier and part of the granite curtain wall. There is potential for damage to the remaining portion of the curtain wall from the removal of a gate pier and part of the curtain wall. The proposal will also impact the entrance gates visually. The pier and curtain wall will be reinstated on a like for like basis.

## **6.22. Visual Impact/Townscape**

- 6.22.1. The Proposed Scheme has been subject to an iterative design development process, which I note, has sought insofar as practicable to avoid or reduce negative impacts, including townscape and visual impacts. Nevertheless, the Proposed Scheme will give rise to some degree of townscape and visual effect, most notably during the Construction Phase. These impacts arise especially where there is temporary and / or permanent acquisition of lands associated with residential or other properties including amenities, and where tree removal is required. The Proposed Scheme includes for replacement of disturbed boundaries, reinstatement of the Construction

Compounds, return of temporary acquisition areas, and for additional tree and other planting where possible along the Proposed Scheme.

6.22.2. Construction of the Proposed Scheme will require the limited removal of existing trees and other plantings at specific locations along the road corridor. These include trees along Harold's Cross Road (seven street trees) plus a single tree in an open space adjacent to the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice. Four young trees will be removed from areas around Robert Emmet Bridge. Four street trees will be removed from Clanbrassil Street Upper / Lower and New Street South.

6.22.3. The proposed scheme includes the following:

- Provision of new roadside tree planting and new carriageway median with new street tree planting on Kimmage Road Lower.
- Improved urban realm with new concrete block paving and formalised parking spaces to front of commercial units on Kimmage Road Lower to either side of junction with Corrib road.
- Improved urban realm with improved paving, new street tree planting and formalised parking Kimmage Road Lower approaching and surrounding the junction with Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue, subject to agreement with the property owners.
- Provision of new tree planting within public car park off Sundrive Road.
- New street tree and other planting at junction between Mount Argus View and R817 Kimmage Road Lower and
- New street tree planting at junction between Mount Argus Road and R137 Harold's Cross Road.
- New tree planting in proposed carpark off entrance to Our Lady's Hospice.

- New tree planting and sections of improved paving along Harold's Cross Road, and at the junction with Mount Drummond Avenue including new paving and improved pedestrian accessibility at junction with Grove Road and
- New / replacement tree planting along south side of Grand Canal and on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper.
- Alterations around Robert Emmet Bridge, with new cycle / pedestrian bridge on west side and provision of separate footbridge on east side, with widening of approach ramp to the north, and changes to traffic movement on the original bridge. New pedestrian / cycle bridge structures will partially obscure views of the east and west elevations of the existing Robert Emmet Bridge, but this impact is limited by use of glass barriers.
- Introduction of new concrete where appropriate along Clanbrassil Street Upper, Clanbrassil Street Lower and New Street South.
- Extension of the existing street tree planting in the median island on R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower and
- New tree planting and improved paving at St. Patricks Court

6.22.4. At the northern end of the Proposed Scheme at R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / New Street South towards St. Patrick's Cathedral there is a designated preserved view. There will be construction works to the road corridor in the foreground of the view, and I agree that while the works will limit / disrupt the viewpoint, they will not impact on the sensitive characteristics of the view of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

6.22.5. The construction of the Proposed Scheme will include relatively minor works outside of Poddle Park, and along the River Poddle corridor at The Stone Boat feature. The works, which include construction of an elevated cycle / pedestrian boardwalk / path

along the corridor of the River Poddle at Mount Argus Way, will have direct effects on the landscape and visual setting of the areas along a short section of the River Poddle at Mount Argus Way. The works on the main corridor will also impact on the setting of these amenity areas, however the impact is considered acceptable.

- 6.22.6. There are no direct impacts upon the characteristics or features of Harolds Cross Park, however, there will be a minor improvement to the setting with changes to surrounding urban realm including new tree planting which result in a positive effect over the long-term.
- 6.22.7. I note it is submitted that landscape proposals will have regard to the recommendations of Chapter 12 (Biodiversity) in relation to opportunities for provision of biodiversity and of Chapter 13 (Water) in relation to opportunities for incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS).
- 6.22.8. Also, all aspects of the Proposed Scheme within public areas will revert to on-going management and maintenance in accordance with normal operational practices. This will include hard and soft landscape works and townscape measures, new and reinstated tree and other planting, and new and reinstated surfacing and paving.
- 6.22.9. In the Operational Phase negative moderate / significant residual effects will remain for residential properties on Harold's Cross Road experiencing permanent land acquisition. A profound permanent effect will remain for the single removed residential property on Clanbrassil Street Upper. The changes at Emmett Bridge will impact on views of the bridge but will also provide enhanced pedestrian and cycle access, resulting in a moderate neutral residual effect on the amenity of Grand Canal. There will be overall positive effects for all sections of the scheme, as the Proposed Scheme provides for improvements in the urban realm, most notably through an upgraded and consistent paving scheme and new street tree planting, which will result in positive long-term effects for the townscape and visual character.

6.22.10. I note the NTA's submission that the proposed scheme has been developed carefully to integrate with the existing landscaping and park areas along the corridor. Where there is scope within the constraints of the existing urban context, the Proposed Scheme incorporates significant new landscaping, as stated above, consisting of additional street trees at many locations, including a tree lined median island over a length of 170m on Kimmage Road Lower in the Corrib Road area, urban realm improvements along 300m length of streets in Kimmage Village, and various other pockets of new planting and trees at intervals along the route. In this respect the Proposed Scheme has maximised the potential for further greening of this urban corridor which will enhance the biodiversity of the general area. Under the Proposed Scheme new trees will be planted along Harold's Cross Road where space is available and at Robert Emmet Bridge.

6.22.11. Several submissions raised concerns about the temporary impacts of the proposed Construction Compound K3 located on parts of a small public plaza area, as well as the long-term proposals for tree planting as part of an upgrade to the urban realm after the compound is removed. A response to the location of the construction compound at this location has already been set out above under 'Issues Raised'. With respect to the proposal for tree planting and impact to light and residential amenity of the adjoining apartment block fronting St. Patrick's Court / Greenville Place, I note that the NTA will put in place a Communications Plan and will consult with impacted residents on tree replacement that is likely to impinge on their property and a special arboriculturist will be employed to oversee the project.

6.22.12. I note and agree with the NTA that a Tree Bond would not be appropriate for the Proposed Scheme, it is noted that there are no mature historic trees that would be affected by the Proposed Scheme. There are no TPOs or tree preservation objectives pertaining to the construction works area of the Proposed Scheme.



- 6.22.13. I note the Photomontages submitted in support of the proposed scheme. The proposed views are shown with proposed planting at approximately 10 to 15 years post-completion of the Construction Phase. The Photomontages have been prepared in accordance with the methodology set out in Section 17.2.4.8 of the EIAR and are included in Figure 17.2 Photomontages in Volume 3 of the EIAR.
- 6.22.14. Having regard to the plans and photomontages submitted, I am, in the main, satisfied that the proposal will have a positive impact on the landscape and to people's experience of the street. The softening of landscaping enhances the pedestrian and cyclist experience and has a positive impact on the perception of an area overall.
- 6.22.15. In relation to the visual impact and setting of Protected Structures and other historical structures, including street furniture, lamp stands and post boxes etc. and ACAs, such matters have been examined within the Cultural Heritage Section of the EIAR below and this section should therefore be read in conjunction with the relevant sections of the EIAR.
- 6.22.16. Overall, there would be a relatively small loss of public lands and private / garden area which will result in a partial loss of landscape amenity space, but there would be no material substantial diminution to the key characteristics of the streetscape or properties. I am satisfied based on the nature of the proposed works that there will be no discernible impact to the visual amenities or setting of these protected structures or the wider area at this location, provided formal agreement and approval with DCC architectural conservation officer is sought and agreed prior to commencement of works.
- 6.22.17. The removal and setting back of boundaries along the route will not alter the overall character of the area or the overall appearance of any of the properties to such a degree as to warrant a refusal of the proposed scheme. I recommend that

conditions be attached regarding tree protection measures for all existing trees and that prior to the replacement of trees, hedging and planting which is to be removed the NTA shall liaise with the relevant landowner with regard to the species, size and location of all replacement vegetation. The NTA shall also employ the services of an appropriately qualified arboriculturist and Landscape Architect for the full duration of the proposed works to ensure landscaping and tree works are implemented appropriately.

- 6.22.18. I note DCC's submission in relation to more green infrastructure along the route. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed development will make a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area, whilst there will be some noticeable changes for individual properties along the route the overall scheme will provide a much-improved environment for residents, pedestrians, cyclist and motorists traversing and living in the area. The Proposed Scheme will also provide for a significantly enhanced level of service for public transport and for pedestrian / cycle connectivity.

### **6.23. Biodiversity**

- 6.23.1. A number of the submissions raised concern about biodiversity impact. Concern is specifically raised with respect to loss of trees and impact of the proposed boardwalk on biodiversity in The River Poddle and Mount Argus Park. As is evident from the preceding sections of this report, there is much cross over in terms of issues raised in submissions received. I endeavour, in this planning assessment to address specific issues raised, I highlight I do not intend to reiterate assessment of issues already covered above. Trees and vegetation to be removed are described in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment which is included within Appendix A17.1 of the EIAR. The impact assessment on the flora and fauna is described in Chapter 12

Biodiversity in Volume 2 of the EIAR. I refer the Board to Section 8.0 EIAR Assessment of this report where at paragraph 9.34 Biodiversity is considered in detail and a summary of potential & residual effects is set out in Table 11 Biodiversity.

- 6.23.2. The NTA submit that the mitigation strategy (Chapter 12 Biodiversity at Section 12.5) includes mitigation for both construction and operation, as necessary, in respect of protected species confirmed present or on a precautionary basis likely to occur based on desktop data search and professional judgement - Birds, Bats and other mammals as well as habitat replacement and – through the landscaping design. The mitigation measures, which will be implemented on the Proposed Scheme will mitigate impacts on breeding birds, bats etc. to levels that are not significant at any geographic scale and that the flexibility provided in the mitigation measures in terms of timing of removal of vegetation are appropriate given the nature of most of the vegetation within the Proposed Scheme boundary. It is contended that, there are no significant residual effects on protected species following adoption of the mitigation measures prescribed.
- 6.23.3. I note that the protection of water quality is an integral element of the mitigation strategy across all Key Ecological Receptors (KERs) and across the entirety of the proposed scheme and further afield as documented in Chapter 12 Biodiversity for both construction and operation e.g., Protection of European sites (Sections 12.5.1.1.1) and , Habitats (Section 12.5.1.2 & 12.5.2.2), Protected species (Section, 12.5.1.3 & 12.5.2.3), fisheries (Section 12.5.1.8 & 12.5.2.8) and distal marine mammals (Section 12.5.1.4.4 & 12.5.2.4.4), as well as the mitigation measures provided for in Chapter 13 Water, (see Section 13.5). In terms of significance with respect to Bats, the tree losses which are along the edge of an artificially lit roadway are not considered significant in terms of potential commuting//foraging territory

except at a local scale. The Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme is not predicted to result in any significant effects on populations of bats in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme. Therefore, no mitigation is proposed.

6.23.4. Mitigation has been prescribed for breeding birds (Section 12.5.2.5), preconstruction surveys for mammals – badger, bats, roost confirmation and or usage (Section 12.5.1.4), provision of Bat boxes, no vegetation clearance during the bird nesting season (Section 12.5.1.5.1) and good site practices in demarcating the works area, as are prescribed in the CEMP Appendix A5.1.

6.23.5. As set out in detail below in the EIAR section of this report under biodiversity, only one tree containing PRFs was identified within the temporary land take boundary with the Construction Compound K2 at Our Lady's Hospice. While this area will not be returned to the greenspace upon completion, the tree is being retained. It is highlighted that additional, trees that are currently unsuitable may become roosts between the pre-planning assessment contained within this EIAR and the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme. It is proposed to install generalist / self-cleaning bat boxes for each tree containing PRFs that is confirmed to be removed.

6.23.6. In respect of wildlife along the River Poddle at the Stone Boat the EIAR Volume 2 Chapter 12 Biodiversity assesses the potential impacts on biodiversity as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. The EIAR presents the output of the biodiversity assessment and contains information regarding, inter alia, the biodiversity baseline scenario, the potential impacts on biodiversity, the mitigation measures and the predicted residual effects associated with the Proposed Scheme. The proposed works at the Stone Boat have been detailed in full in section 3.0 of this report 'Proposed Development'.

6.23.7. Section 12.4.4 of the EIAR describes the potential biodiversity impacts that could occur as a result of the operation of the Proposed Scheme. The proposed boardwalk at the Stone Boat is specifically referenced and includes:

- Section 12.4.4.4.3 addresses the potential impacts on otters. It concludes under a variety of topics that the Proposed Scheme (and specifically the boardwalk) will not result in significant impacts on otters at any geographic scale.
- Section 12.4.4.5 addresses the potential impacts on birds. Localised disturbance effects on breeding birds will most likely be of greater impact at the River Poddle, than the remainder of the Proposed Scheme. The provision of the Stone Boat Boardwalk along the River Poddle has the potential to result in increased human presence in this area. It is considered that there may be temporary non-significant effects on breeding riparian birds at a local scale, until such a time that they have established new nesting sites.
- Section 12.5 outlines the detailed mitigation measures that will be implemented along the Proposed Scheme to minimise impacts. A Surface Water Management Plan (see Section 12.5.1.2.2) has been prepared and will be implemented by the contractor. Additional measures are proposed for the Construction of the Stone Boat boardwalk.
- Section 12.6 sets out the residual impacts as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. Tables 12.15 and 12.16 summarise the construction and operational phase significant residual impacts respectively. No significant residual biodiversity impacts are predicted as a result of the Proposed Scheme (including for the Stone Boat).

6.23.8. Regard being had to the information contained in the EIAR and proposed mitigation it is considered that the proposed scheme is will not result in significant negative effects to water quality in the River Poddle or to Mount Argus Park. I am satisfied that the biodiversity issues raised in the submissions are adequately addressed in the EIAR.

#### **6.24. Residential Amenity,**

6.24.1. It is important to note at the outset that concerns relating to residential amenity are outlined in different ways in a number of submissions received and whilst many submissions relate to a particular section of the proposed scheme, such as: Harolds Cross Park, Clanbrassil Street, Mount Argus Estate, Derravaragh Road and Corrib Road closures, construction compound locations, safety for pedestrians and cyclists, relocation or omission of bus stops, right turn bans, diversion of traffic and impact upon access for local traffic, bus gates etc... It is important to clarify that the impact to residents and consideration of same is central to the entirety of this assessment and is one of the key considerations of the EIAR section below. Consideration has been given throughout the report to impact upon Harolds Cross, Kimmage Village, road closures, project design, consideration of alternatives, proposed Bus Stops strategy and bus gates. I am of the opinion that the issues raised with respect to Robert Emmet Bridge, concealment / burial of historic walls at Clanbrassil Street Upper, the Boardwalk structure at Mount Argus Estate (antisocial behaviour, safety and security issues, impact upon Stone Boat feature), the removal of the footpath to the south of Harolds Cross Park, the demolition of No. 32A Clanbrassil Street, access arrangements to properties, inter alia, Gordon's Fuels, Dawnlane / Mullen's Scrap Larkview FC, Mount Jerome cemetery and Crematorium, Our Lady's Care Hospice, other community uses, services, commercial and residential premises, bollard

restrictions at Derravaragh Road / Corrib Roads, have been dealt with individually above in the preceding sections of this report and in the EIAR section of this report below.

- 6.24.2. I note the CPO Report 317682-23 which accompanies this report and also deals with similar submissions. The project is justified in terms of principle, common good, community need, national and local policy context for climate change and sustainable movement and transport.
- 6.24.3. Issues such as justification, need, loss of privacy, impact upon property values etc common to all areas have already been dealt with in the CPO report which accompanies this report and throughout the subject report. In the interests of avoidance of over duplication of issues and concerns raised both reports should be read in conjunction with one another. There is a substantial cross over of issues and concerns raised in both the roads CPO case 317682-23 and in the subject planning case. I have read all of the submissions in detail and read and considered the NTA's detailed response to each issue raised. The level of cross referencing in term of issues raised is considerable. As set out in the CPO case (317682-23) I consider that the proposed scheme and CPO can be considered / approved at the same time, in fact it is encumbering upon the Board to do so. There are many practical reasons, including, in relation to the practicalities of delivering the scheme, the efficient use of the decision maker's resources and consistent consideration of issues raised, as to why it is entirely appropriate to deal with the section 51 application and the related application for confirmation of the CPO together.
- 6.24.4. I highlight that construction of the Proposed Scheme will require land acquisition from 29 residential properties: a shared forecourt at Nos. 14 to 26 on the western side of Harold's Cross Road, Nos. 33 to 61 (odd numbers) on the eastern side of Harold's Cross Road, and No. 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper (residence adjacent to Gordon's

Fuels). The houses (33 to 61) have mature established gardens with original boundary walls, entrance gates and stepped access paths. Construction works for widening of the road corridor will result in the removal of the existing boundaries including walls and entrance gates, portions of gardens, private property and associated plantings. The works will temporarily remove the railings and gravel area fronting Nos. 14 to 26 Harold's Cross Road. Access to properties will be retained. Construction works adjacent to and within these private and adjoining public areas will be openly visible from these properties. No 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper will be completely demolished to allow construction of the access ramp to Gordan's Fuels. The sensitivity is high, and the magnitude of change is very high. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on these properties is assessed in the EIAR to be Negative, Very Significant and Temporary / Short-Term with the exception of No 32A which is Negative, Profound and Permanent.

6.24.5. I note that, during construction, there will be some temporary disruption / alterations to on-street and off-street parking provision, and access to property in certain locations along the Proposed Scheme. The NTA submit that local arrangements will be made on a case-by-case basis to maintain continued access to homes and businesses affected by the works, at all times, where practicable. Details regarding temporary access provisions will be discussed with residents and business owners prior to construction starting in the area. The duration of the works will vary from property to property, but access and egress will be maintained at all times.

6.24.6. I consider that the project design is justified and the rationale and response by the NTA to matters raised is robust. The NTA are open to further engagement with DCC and I am in agreement with the NTA that in general issues raised can be addressed as part of the design development phase of the project and that design details,



access, construction requirements, tree planting and protection, etc. can be reviewed and agreed between DCC and the NTA and between property owners affected and the NTA. I highlight that subject to conditions being attached with respect to the following matters that the proposed scheme is deemed acceptable:

- Mitigation measures and environmental commitments.
- A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan and a Construction Stage Mobility Management Plan.
- Traffic flow Monitoring.
- An improved pedestrian crossing at the junction to the south western end of the link street at Harolds Cross Park where it joins Kimmage Road Lower,
- Planters instead of bollards at Derravaragh Road / Neagh Road / Corrib Road.
- Noise monitoring shall be carried out during the construction phase of the proposed road development.
- Protection of trees.
- Prior to the replacement of trees and hedging and planting which is to be removed, the National Transport Authority shall liaise with the relevant landowner with regard to the species, size and location of all replacement vegetation. Tree protection measures for all existing trees shall be put in place prior to commencement of development or phases of development and all details of soft landscaping shall be submitted to the planning authority for agreement prior to implementation. The National Transport Authority shall also employ the services of an appropriately qualified arboriculturist and Landscape Architect to advise on landscaping and tree works.

- 6.24.7. It is submitted by the NTA that the entire area identified for temporary acquisition will not be required for the duration of the works. It is acknowledged that during the construction of the works there will be inconveniences for all users, but this will be managed to minimise impacts for all affected parties. I note that prior to undertaking any accommodation works within private property, the appointed contractor will engage in consultation with landowners, during consultation the landowner will have an opportunity to raise any concerns and outline any requirements associated with the land in question.
- 6.24.8. A number of submissions raise concerns about noise and air quality arising from the proposed scheme and in some instances due to the removal of existing vegetated boundaries, I would refer the Board to the EIAR section of this report in which such impacts are robustly examined and whereby it is concluded that no significant impacts in relation to either factor is expected to arise. The proposed scheme is expected to have a long-term positive impact on noise and air quality as the introduction of a fully electric fleet and the overall reduction of vehicular traffic travelling along the route will significantly improve the current situation in terms of these emissions.
- 6.24.9. I have considered issues of impacts upon the quality of residents' lives, in relation to noise, dust, vibration, construction compounds, access, visual amenity, loss of public amenity, biodiversity, cultural heritage, archaeological impact, architectural heritage impact, traffic dispersal into residential areas, and construction traffic. I note the robust Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and proposed traffic management measures (CTMP) prepared for the project. The appointed contractor will liaise with landowners through the Communications Plan agreed with the NTA, where access to their property is temporarily affected by works. The contractor will also be required to keep the effectiveness of the mitigation measures under review.

- 6.24.10. I am satisfied that no significant long-term impacts are expected to arise along the proposed scheme that would impact residential amenity to such a degree as to warrant a refusal.
- 6.24.11. On balance, I consider that the proposed scheme will have positive impacts on residential amenity through the general improvement to the street environment. Residential areas along the CBC will then become healthier and better places to live. This substantially outweighs the negative impacts of the project which will mostly be short term and concentrated in the construction phase. Over time, as landscaping matures, any adverse impacts during the operational phase will become less perceptible. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed works including the reallocation of road space and temporary use of construction compounds would not impact residents or businesses to such a level as to warrant a refusal of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.24.12. I highlight for the attention of the Board that the proposed Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme is supported and welcomed by Dublin City Council and many of the observations received.
- 6.24.13. The development of the project will provide an upgraded and expanded bus network and quality of service together with better quality cycling and pedestrian facilities and I acknowledged that these improvements will make it easier for people to access and use public transport. I also acknowledge that the proposed scheme will, in turn, promote modal shift from the private car to more sustainable forms of transport including walking, cycling and public transport, ultimately contributing to the creation of a greener and more sustainable city.

## **6.25. Other Issues**

### Impact upon property values

- 6.25.1. Several concerns relate to impact on property values. Some of the reasons quoted for the decrease in value include increase traffic volumes, increased bus numbers and speeds, poorer air quality, increased noise and compulsory purchase order.
- 6.25.2. The Proposed Scheme will enhanced walking, cycling and bus infrastructure on this key access corridor, which will enable and deliver efficient, safe, and integrated sustainable transport movement along the corridor. It will greatly improve transport services for all that live along the route, by providing significantly improved sustainable transport options, thereby reducing impacts upon air quality.
- 6.25.3. In general, I note the NTA's response that in overall terms the public realm improvements planned by the NTA may lead to an increase in value of both residential and retail property prices, along the corridor, with evidence showing that investing in public realm creates nicer places that are more desirable for people and business to locate in, thereby increasing the value of properties in the area.
- 6.25.4. I agree that a combination of improved connectivity as a result of the dedicated public transport infrastructure being rolled out as well as public realm improvements, will not have a negative impact on values of residential properties along the scheme.
- 6.25.5. Overall, I am satisfied that there is a justifiable need for the proposed scheme. I am also satisfied that the proposal would not impact residents in any negative manner and is compliant with international best practice and in line with all government policies in terms of connecting populations to high quality active travel and public transport corridors.

Increased traffic volumes, pedestrian safety & displacement of traffic to surrounding streets.

- 6.25.6. A number of submissions raised concerns around the impact of the proposal, in particular the proposed bus gates, on traffic movement in the area.

6.25.7. As set out in Section 2.1 of EIAR Chapter 2 'Need for the Scheme', the proposed scheme is needed in order to enable and deliver efficient, safe and integrated sustainable transport movement along the corridor through the provision of enhanced walking, cycling and bus infrastructure on a key access corridor in the Dublin region.

6.25.8. Overall, I believe the scheme will provide an attractive alternative to the private car and promote a modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling. I believe it has been determined that the impact of the reduction in general traffic flows along the route will be a positive, moderate and long-term effect whilst the impact of the redistributed general traffic along the surrounding road network will have a negative, slight and long-term effect. Thus, overall, there will be no significant deterioration in the general traffic environment in the study area as a consequence of meeting the scheme objectives of providing enhanced sustainable mode priority along the direct study area. In meeting its objectives, the Proposed Scheme will deliver strong positive impacts in terms of promoting active travel and sustainable transport. As noted previously in this report, in section 6.4 'Reliability of Traffic Modelling Data Counts and Up to Date Nature of the Information', the modelled forecasts for the 2028 opening year indicate:

- A significant decrease in people travelling to/from the city by car in each peak period with decreases of 50% and 35% in the AM and PM peak periods respectively.
- A significant increase in people travelling by public transport in each peak period with increases of 80% and 79% in the AM and PM peak periods respectively.
- An increase in people walking/cycling in each peak period with increases of 8% and 34% in the AM and PM peak periods respectively.

6.25.9. I note sections 6.6 'Route Alternatives Considered' and section 6.7 'Project / Junction Design' above, which are of relevance to traffic volume, safety and displacement. I highlight it is concluded that the scale of the BusConnects CBC Infrastructure Works will be transformational for cycling in Dublin, delivering a large number of the primary cycling routes identified in the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network plan.

6.25.10. The assessment presented in Table 17 of Appendix A6.4.4 in Volume 4 of the EIAR (2043 AM Junction Analysis), shows that the proposed scheme would result in a 'Not Significant' effect on most of the extensive list of junctions assessed and an 'Imperceptible' effect on two junctions, namely: 'Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue / Kimmage Road Lower' and the 'R112 / Rathfarnham Road / Dodder Park Road / Rathfarnham Road'. I refer again to my assessment above in section 6.7 of this report 'Project / Junction Design'. Where it is concluded that the proposed scale of the BusConnects CBC Infrastructure Works will be transformational for cycling in Dublin, delivering a large number of the primary cycling routes identified in the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network plan. With proposals of this scale, it is critical that the overall design approach matches the stated ambition and can achieve a longevity that such investment deserves. Also, section 6.17 'Pedestrian footpath widths and public realm' where it is considered that the Proposed Scheme will facilitate a modal shift from car dependency through the provision of walking, cycle, and bus infrastructure enhancements thereby contributing to an efficient, integrated transport system and facilitating a shift to a low carbon and climate resilient city. The proposed scheme will result in the provision of new / refurbished pedestrian facilities and footpaths along the scheme and associated ancillary works. I note pedestrian facilities across the scheme shall be improved, with additional crossing locations, increased pedestrian directness, provision of traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds, improved accessibility and increased footway and crossing widths. I consider the public realm upgrades, including widened

footpaths, high quality hard and soft landscaping contribute towards a safer, more attractive environment for pedestrians.

6.25.11. All proposed facilities have been designed in accordance with the principles of DMURS and the National Disability Authority (NDA) 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design Approach' (NDA 2020) with regards to catering for all users, including those with disabilities. As previously stated, I am satisfied that the scheme has been developed having regard to relevant accessibility guidance and universal design principles so as to provide access for all users.

6.25.12. Overall, it is anticipated that there will be a positive, significant and long-term effect to the quality of the pedestrian, cycle and bus infrastructure along entire scheme, during the operational phase, which aligns with the overarching aims and objectives of the scheme. I acknowledge the attraction of the private car, and that it may be the only viable option for some for medium to longer distance journeys. I also note that the level of access for private motor vehicles will be altered, however, it has been largely retained, albeit redirected along the CBC. It is notable that CSO figures show that more than half of travellers use the car for journeys under 2km. If drivers are limited to a realistic speed limit, the introduction of bus gates and turn bans with enhanced pedestrian and cycle infrastructure they may begin to realise that alternative modes, particularly with the emergence of e-bikes and e-scooters, are just as attractive.

6.25.13. In summary, it is my opinion that while there will be some redistribution of traffic as a result of the proposed scheme, the traffic impact is considered to be negligible. See also section 8.0 EIAR 'Roads and Traffic' assessment of this report.

## **6.26. Recommended Conditions.**

- 6.26.1. I note in their submissions that DCC has included lists of recommended conditions, see section 4.3 of this report above for a detailed list of recommended conditions from Architects Section, Conservation Section, Environment Protection Division and Parks and Landscape Services Division. Where relevant to any of the above assessment these have been discussed previously. The Board should note that the conditions did not raise any significant issues in relation to the route or principle of the proposed scheme and were focused on detailed design issues at Robert Emmet Bridge, the historic retaining wall on Clanbrassil Street Upper and the Board Walk at The Stone Boat Feature. I have concluded that the design as presented is acceptable.
- 6.26.2. A number of the conditions requested are seeking contractual agreements to be conditioned in terms of handover, management, and maintenance of the Scheme following construction. In relation to these items, I am satisfied that the relevant legislative provisions are in place for the construction and handover of the roads infrastructure to render the attachment of such conditions unnecessary.
- 6.26.3. Other conditions are requested to ensure ongoing liaison, agreement, and engagement in relation to a number of detailed measures such as drainage, methodologies of conservation and recording and carrying out works around heritage items, traffic management, agreement on detailed design features, reinstatement works, standards to be adopted. I consider that such conditions requiring further liaison and agreement with the relevant location authority to be generally acceptable and in accordance with best practice, although I note that the applicant has stated that such liaison will occur as a matter of course and that additional specific conditions are not required, I consider that the imposition of such conditions on any consent that may issue would be appropriate, in some instances only, in the interests



of proper planning and sustainable development, see attached 20 recommended conditions.

## **6.27. Conclusion on Proper Planning and Sustainable Development**

6.27.1. Overall, I am satisfied that the Proposed Scheme will deliver significant improvements to bus, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, which will facilitate a reduction in traffic congestion, promotion in the use of sustainable modes of transport all while minimising impacts on the amenities of the area, residential population, heritage features, and biodiversity. I am of the opinion that the subject works if implemented will encourage a significant modal shift from the private car towards sustainable travel modes into and out of the city. In this regard I have reviewed all submissions lodged and noted the concerns raised by third parties. I acknowledge the issues raised and note that there will be a certain level of impact and inconvenience during the construction phase throughout, and some changes and alterations during the operational phase, however, I do not consider that these impacts are significant or significantly adverse having regard to the overall benefits that will arise from the Proposed Scheme. I am satisfied that the application documentation is clear and demonstrates that the scheme has been designed to minimise impacts and that robust justification has been provided in relation to the various elements of the infrastructure proposed. Furthermore, I consider that the application documentation contains a comprehensive suite of mitigation measures which will minimise impacts where and as they arise. I consider that the Proposed Scheme has demonstrated that it will contribute to the reduction in emissions and improve the efficiency of people movement throughout the city. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the Proposed Scheme is in accordance with the proper planning and

sustainable development of the area, subject to compliance with the mitigation measures set out and conditions attached in my recommendation below.

## **7.0 Appropriate Assessment**

### **7.1. Consideration of the Likely Significant Effects on a European Site**

#### **Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive**

7.2. The requirements of Article 6(3) as related to appropriate assessment of a project under part XAB are considered fully in this section. The areas addressed in this section are as follows:

- The Natura Impact Statement
- Screening for Appropriate Assessment
- Appropriate assessment of implications of the proposed development on the integrity of each European site.

#### **The Natura Impact Statement and Supplemental Information**

7.3. The application is accompanied by an AA Screening report and an NIS (2023) which describes the proposed development, the project area and the surrounding area. The construction management plan is also a key document in terms of the implementation of mitigation measures.

7.4. All ecology and Appropriate Assessment related documents have been prepared by staff ecologists from Scott Cawley and informed by desk study including reference material from the NPWS website and data base and by field surveys.

7.5. A description of all baseline surveys is outlined within section 4.6 of the NIS. The following is a list of surveys undertaken:

- Habitats, Flora and Fauna surveys, were carried out in June and August 2018, in August and in May 2022.
- Otter surveys were undertaken between June and August 2018, and in August and October 2020, as well as follow on surveys in March 2022.
- Wintering Bird surveys -
  - A desk study was carried out to identify any potential suitable inland feeding and / or roosting sites for winter birds located within or directly adjacent to the Proposed Scheme. This included a review of recent aerial photography and known inland feeding sites for the SCI bird species light-bellied Brent goose *Branta bernicla hrota*. A habitat suitability assessment was carried out in October 2020 to verify the suitability of potential inland feeding / roosting sites identified during the desk study.
  - There were no suitable wintering bird sites which would be subject to habitat loss by to the Proposed Scheme. A single known ex-situ winter bird feeding site, Eamonn Ceannt Park, is located within 300m of the Proposed Scheme boundary along Sundrive Road.
  - Given the existing busy nature of Sundrive Road, the minor works proposed along Sundrive Road (comprising retention of existing surfaces and cycleway tie in) and the existing screening present, in the form of an existing row of 2-storey houses and gardens along the eastern portion of Sundrive Road and an existing mature treeline within the perimeter of Eamonn Ceannt Park, effectively separating the Proposed Scheme from the ex-situ winter bird feeding site by approximately 100m. As such, winter bird surveys were deemed unnecessary for the Proposed Scheme. The results of the desk-based study have informed the

assessment of potential impacts on wintering bird species arising from the Proposed Scheme.

- Kingfisher surveys were carried out in November 2020 as well as a follow on survey, in March 2022.
- Aquatic habitat surveys were carried out in July 2022 at a number of locations, namely: the proposed Poddle Cycleway and Stone Boat Boardwalk at Mount Argus View and the proposed offline footbridges at the existing Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal.

- 7.6. The receiving environment is described in line with standard methodology (Fossitt 2000) and results of the field surveys are presented in NIS Section 5 and considered further in my assessment below.
- 7.7. There were no non-native invasive plant species, listed on the Third Schedule of the (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011 (as amended), identified along or adjacent to the Proposed Scheme.
- 7.8. No records of any Annex II plant species were recorded within the footprint of the proposed scheme during field surveys.
- 7.9. No signs of otter, an Annex II species, were originally recorded during surveys within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme. No signs of otter were recorded within 150m upstream and downstream of the proposed Poddle Cycleway and Stone Boat Boardwalk at Mount Argus View and the proposed offline pedestrian / cycle bridges at the existing Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal. However, the July 2022 aquatic survey recorded a single otter spraint on the ledge underneath Emmet Bridge.
- 7.10. The nearest European site for which this species is designated is the Wicklow Mountains SAC, which is located approximately 8.1km south (as the crow flies) of the

Proposed Scheme. Otter territories are within the range of approximately 7.5km for females and can reach up to 21 km for males via hydrological pathways (O' Neill et al., 2009). The River Dodder and Liffey Estuary provide the key pathway to Wicklow Mountains SAC, whereas the Proposed Scheme will discharge to the River Poddle (Poddle\_010) and Ringsend WwTP. Although Wicklow Mountains SAC is located within the same sub-catchment (Dodder\_SC\_010) to the Proposed Scheme, the River Poddle and River Dodder are not hydrologically connected and are separated by approximately 600m of urbanised areas at their closest point at Bancroft Park. As such, populations of otter within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme are deemed not to be connected to the SAC population.

- 7.11. As stated above, there were no suitable wintering bird sites which would be subject to habitat loss by the Proposed Scheme. A single known ex-situ winter bird feeding site, Eamonn Ceannt Park, is located within 300m of the Proposed Scheme boundary along Sundrive Road.
- 7.12. A number of SPAs have been included on a precautionary basis for assessment as it cannot with certainty be confirmed that their Special Conservation Interest species do not use areas in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme as ex-situ habitat.
- 7.13. Habitat suitability assessments surveys carried out in November 2020 and March 2022 recorded no evidence of any Kingfisher nest holes within 500m upstream or downstream of the proposed Poddle Cycleway and Stone Boat Boardwalk at Mount Argus View and the proposed offline cycle / pedestrian bridges at the existing Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal. No kingfisher were recorded within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme, during the multi-disciplinary or habitat suitability assessment surveys. The nearest European site for which this species is designated is the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA, which is located approximately 38.8km north of the

Proposed Scheme. Kingfisher populations within close proximity to the Proposed Scheme are not deemed to be SCI species.

- 7.14. There is one existing surface water catchment within the Proposed Scheme. The Proposed Scheme will run close to the Poddle River for its entirety and currently discharges to a combination of surface water sewers that discharge to the River Poddle in the southern part of the Proposed Scheme, as well as the existing combined sewer systems to the Ringsend wastewater treatment plant (WwTP). It is proposed to connect proposed drainage infrastructure into the existing surface water sewer. The existing road and bridge network consists primarily of curb and gully, with no treatment or attenuation within the network. Surface waters from the Proposed Scheme will drain to a combination of surface water sewer discharging to the Poddle\_010 and combined sewer discharging to Ringsend WwTP.
- 7.15. The drainage design principles ensure that there will be no net increase in the surface water flow discharged to these receptors.
- 7.16. **The Proposed Scheme does not overlap with any European site.** The Proposed Scheme is hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, via the receiving surface water network which is located approximately 6.7km downstream of the proposed crossing point on the Grand Canal. This is followed by South Dublin Bay SAC, which is located approximately 7.5km downstream of the proposed crossing point on the Grand Canal. There are seven European sites located in Dublin Bay which are downstream of the Proposed Schemes three watercourses that are hydrologically connected to the Proposed Scheme (i.e. River Poddle (Poddle\_010), Grand Canal Main Line and Liffey Estuary Lower).
- 7.17. There are a number of SPAs designated for SCI species that are known to forage and / or roost at inland sites across Dublin City and / or utilise Dublin Bay. These include South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA, North Bull Island SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA,

Baldoyle Bay SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, Lambay Island SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, and The Murrough SPA. In addition, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC and Lambay Island SAC are designated for mobile QI species known to utilise the Dublin Bay and the Liffey Estuary Lower.

- 7.18. There is the possibility for significant effects on the following European sites, in the absence of mitigation, either arising from the project alone, or in combination with other plans and projects, as a result of hydrological impacts, hydrogeological impacts, invasive species and disturbance and displacement impacts: North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Lambay Island SAC, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, Rockabill SPA and The Murrough SPA.
- 7.19. The potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment, the zone of influence, and the European sites at risk of likely significant effects are summarised in Table 5. 'Summary of the potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment, their potential zone of influence, and the European sites within the zone of influence', of the submitted NIS.
- 7.20. Details on the water quality of each watercourse, as sourced from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the distances from the proposed crossing point to downstream waterbodies are also provided in Table 4.
- 7.21. The scientific assessment to inform AA is presented in sections 5 -7 of the NIS and in the documentation submitted to the Board as part of the application. The conservation objectives of the various qualifying interest features and special conservation interest species are listed. Impact pathways are identified and the assessment of likely

significant effects which could give rise to adverse effects on site integrity presented in Tables 7 - 28.

7.22. Mitigation measures are presented from section 7.1.4 of the NIS onwards under each site heading and detailed in full in the Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Invasive Species Management plan. An assessment of potential in-combination effects is presented in Section 9 of the NIS.

**7.23. The NIS together with supplemental information concludes that, following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the relevant information, including the nature of the predicted effects from the proposed development, and mitigation measures to avoid such effects, that the proposed development will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.**

**Adequacy of information submitted by the applicant.**

7.24. Having reviewed the NIS and supplemental information that accompanies the application, I am satisfied that there is adequate information to undertake Screening and Appropriate Assessment of the proposed Kimmage to City Centre CBC scheme on lands comprised of approx. 3.7Km in length and will commence on the R817 Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with the R818 on Terenure Road West and Kimmage Road West and R817 Fortfield Road, all in County Dublin within Dublin City Council and bordering South Dublin County Council administrative areas.

7.25. I am satisfied that all possible European Sites that could in anyway be affected have been considered by the applicant.

7.26. I am satisfied that all ecological survey work and reporting has been undertaken and prepared by competent experts in line with best practice and scientific methods. Information on the competencies and professional memberships of the Ecological



team are provided in the NIS. I am also satisfied that all potential impact mechanisms have been considered and appropriately assessed within the NIS document.

### **Screening for Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.27. The first test of Article 6(3) is to establish if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects to a European site, in which case the development is 'screened in' for further detailed assessment - appropriate assessment (stage 2).
- 7.28. The screening assessment undertaken on behalf of the applicant concluded that the potential for significant effects could not be ruled out for **16 no. European Sites** within the Dublin area in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and thus the proposed development must proceed to (stage 2) Appropriate Assessment, and an NIS prepared to inform this stage. Given the location of the new candidate SPA mentioned above adjacent to these 16 sites I have included this site within my screening for Appropriate Assessment.
- 7.29. I note that in determining the potential significant effects of the proposed development, the applicant took account of the potential for ex-situ effects for foraging birds and mammals such as Otter. It is of note that a precautionary approach has been taken in including SAC and SPA sites in the wider area in the screening exercise. Given that bird species can travel up to 20km from designated sites and that territories range for male otters is 21 Km, the applicant has included sites at some remove from the proposed development site.
- 7.30. Similarly, a precautionary approach has been taken in relation to SCIs associated with SACs in the wider area. Potential impacts and effects considered are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Summary of the potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme on the receiving environment, their potential zone of influence, and the European sites within the zone of influence (*based on applicant's assessment with consideration added for North West Irish Sea cSPA*).**

Potential impacts and zone of influence of effects	European sites within Zone of Influence
<p><b>Habitat loss and Fragmentation</b></p> <p>No European sites are at risk of direct habitat loss impacts.</p> <p>There is no potential for loss of ex situ inland feeding sites used by SCI wintering bird species.</p> <p>There is potential for habitat loss which may occur indirectly as a consequence of severe habitat degradation arising from a reduction in water quality and / or a change to the hydrological regime</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>There are European sites at risk of habitat losses, arising from a reduction in water quality and / or a change to the hydrological regime:</p> <p>Malahide Estuary SPA,  Baldoye Bay SPA,  Rogerstown Estuary SPA,  North Bull Island SPA,  South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA,  Skerries Islands SPA,  Lambay Island SPA,  Ireland's Eye SPA and  The Murrough SPA;  North West Irish Sea cSPA</p>
<p><b>Habitat degradation/ effects on QI/SCI species as a result of hydrological impacts:</b></p> <p>Habitats and species downstream of the Proposed Scheme and the associated surface water drainage discharge points, and downstream of offsite wastewater treatment plants.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>There are European sites at risk of hydrological effects associated with the Proposed Scheme:</p> <p>North Dublin Bay SAC,  South Dublin Bay SAC,  Skerries Islands SPA,</p>

	<p>Rockabill SPA,  Lambay Island SPA,  Ireland's Eye SPA,  North Bull Island SPA,  South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,  Howth Head Coast SPA,  Baldoyle Bay SPA,  Malahide Estuary SPA,  Lambay Island SAC,  Rogerstown Estuary SPA,  Dalkey Islands SPA and  The Murrough SPA  Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC,  North West Irish Sea cSPA</p>
<p><b>Habitat degradation as a result of hydrogeological impacts:</b></p> <p>Groundwater-dependant habitats, and the species those habitats support, in the local area that lie downgradient of the Proposed Scheme.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>The construction of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk across the River Poddle will involve bored piles into the vegetated bank set back from the River Poddle.</p> <p>The release of contaminated surface water runoff and / or an accidental spillage or pollution event into any surface water features during the Construction Phase, or Operation Phase, also has the potential to affect SCI bird species and QI mammal species that commute, forage and loaf in Dublin Port with impacts to:</p>

	<p>North Dublin Bay SAC,  South Dublin Bay SAC,  Skerries Islands SPA,  Rockabill SPA,  Lambay Island SPA,  Ireland's Eye SPA,  North Bull Island SPA,  South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,  Howth Head Coast SPA,  Baldoyle Bay SPA,  Malahide Estuary SPA,  Lambay Island SAC,  Rogerstown Estuary SPA,  Dalkey Islands SPA and  The Murrough SPA  Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC,  North West Irish Sea cSPA</p>
<p><b>Habitat degradation as a result of introducing/spreading non-native invasive species:</b>  Habitat areas within, adjacent to, and potentially downstream of the Proposed Scheme</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>Although no non-native invasive species were recorded during field surveys, there are records of non-native invasive species present within or adjacent to the Proposed Scheme and, therefore, a risk associated with the Proposed Scheme to downstream European sites from the spread/introduction of non-native invasive species to:  South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,  South Dublin Bay SAC,</p>

	North Dublin Bay SAC North Bull Island SPA and North West Irish Sea cSPA
<p><b>Air quality impacts Potentially up to 200m from the Proposed Scheme boundary:</b></p> <p>Potentially up to 50m from the Proposed Scheme boundary and 500m from the Construction Compound at Construction phase, and up to 200 metres at Operation Phase.</p>	<p><b>No</b></p> <p>There are no European sites within this Zol, therefore there are no European sites at risk of air quality effects associated with the Proposed Scheme.</p>
<p><b>Disturbance and displacement impacts:</b></p> <p>Potentially up to several hundred metres from the Proposed Scheme, dependent upon the predicted levels of noise, vibration and visual disturbance associated with the Proposed Scheme, taking into account the sensitivity of the qualifying interest species to disturbance effects.</p> <p>The Zol for disturbance associated with general construction activities for mammal species such as otter, is 150m, while for wintering birds, disturbance effects would not be expected to extend beyond a distance of approximately 300m.</p> <p>There are no European sites within the disturbance Zol of the Proposed Scheme. However, there is a single known ex-situ winter bird feeding area, Eamonn Ceannt Park (major importance) located approximately 60m from the Proposed Scheme boundary, therefore the Proposed Scheme has the potential to result in disturbance / displacement effects to SCIs of surrounding European sites which utilise ex-situ feeding areas.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>There are European sites within the potential zone of influence of disturbance effects associated with the construction or operation of the Proposed Scheme, including:</p> <p>South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA, North Bull Island SPA, Baldoye Bay SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Lambay Island SPA, Ireland's eye SPA Murrough SPA and the North West Irish Sea cSPA.</p>

### Screening Determination (recommendation)

7.31. Having regard to the information presented in the AA Screening Report, NIS, submissions, the nature, size and location of the proposed development and its likely direct, indirect and cumulative effects, the source pathway receptor principle and sensitivities of the ecological receptors, I concur with the applicant's screening determination that there is potential for significant effects on the following European sites:

- North Dublin Bay SAC,
- South Dublin Bay SAC,
- Howth Head Coast SPA,
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC,
- Lambay Island SAC,
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,
- North Bull Island SPA,
- Dalkey Islands SPA,
- Rockabill SPA,
- Baldoyle Bay SPA,
- Malahide Estuary SPA,
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA,
- Skerries Islands SPA,
- Ireland's Eye SPA,
- Lambay Island SPA and,
- The Murrough SPA.
- North West Irish Sea cSPA\*

\* New candidate SPA.

7.31.1. Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of all relevant information, in view of best scientific knowledge, and applying the precautionary principle, it is reasonable to conclude that there is the possibility for significant effects on the following European sites, in the absence of mitigation, either arising from the project alone or in combination with other plans and projects, as a result of habitat loss / fragmentation, hydrological impacts, non-native invasive species, and disturbance and displacement impacts. As screening is considered a pre-assessment stage, further analysis is required to determine the significance of such impacts and to apply any mitigation measures to exclude adverse effects. Therefore, North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Lambay Island SAC, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, Rockabill SPA, The Murrough SPA and North West Irish Sea cSPA are brought forward for inclusion in the Stage 2 AA. Above-listed 17 no. European sites (4 no. SACs and 13no. SPAs)

**Appropriate Assessment (recommendation)**

7.32. The following is an objective assessment of the implications of the proposal on the relevant conservation objectives of the European sites based on the scientific information provided by the applicant and taking into account expert opinion and submissions on nature conservation. It is based on an examination of all relevant documentation and submissions, analysis and evaluation of potential impacts, findings conclusions. A final determination will be made by the Board.

7.33. All aspects of the project which could result in significant effects are assessed and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce any adverse effects on site integrity are examined and evaluated for effectiveness. I have relied on the following guidance:

- DoEHLG (2009). Appropriate Assessment of Plans and Projects in Ireland: Guidance for Planning Authorities. Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Dublin
- EC (2018) Managing Natura 2000 sites. The provisions of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC
- EC (2021) Assessment of plans and projects in relation to Natura 2000 sites. Methodological guidance on Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EC.

**Relevant European sites:**

7.34. In the absence of mitigation or further detailed analysis, the potential for significant effects could not be excluded for:

- North Dublin Bay SAC,
- South Dublin Bay SAC,
- Howth Head Coast SPA,
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC,
- Lambay Island SAC,
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA,
- North Bull Island SPA,
- Dalkey Islands SPA,
- Rockabill SPA,
- Baldoyle Bay SPA,
- Malahide Estuary SPA,
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA,
- Skerries Islands SPA,



- Ireland's Eye SPA,
- Lambay Island SPA and,
- The Murrough SPA.
- North West Irish Sea cSPA\*

\* New candidate SPA.

7.35. A description of the sites and their Conservation Objectives and Qualifying Interests/Special Conservation Interests, including relevant attributes and targets for these sites, are set out in the NIS Section 7- Assessment of Effects.

7.36. I have also examined the Conservation Objectives Supporting Documents for these sites, available through the NPWS website ([www.npws.ie](http://www.npws.ie)).

7.37. I agree with the AA screening by the applicant that further analysis is not required to determine the significance of such impacts and to apply any mitigation measures to exclude adverse effects. Therefore, only the sites listed above in 7.34 of this report are brought forward for further assessment.

7.38. Tables 2-7 below summarise the information considered for the Appropriate Assessment and site integrity test. I have taken this information from that provided by the applicant within the NIS. I expand on certain issues further in my report.

**Table 2: AA summary matrix for North Dublin Bay SAC**

North Dublin Bay SAC [000206]			
Detailed Conservation Objectives available: <a href="#">ConservationObjectives.rdl (npws.ie)</a>			
Summary of Appropriate Assessment			
Special Conservation Interest (SCI)	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures

<b>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</b>	<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide in North Dublin Bay SAC. Maintain the extent of the <i>Mytilus edulis</i>-dominated community.</p> <p>Conserve the high quality of the <i>Mytilus edulis</i>-dominated community, subject to natural processes.</p> <p>Conserve the communities of fine sand to sandy mud with <i>Pygospio elegans</i> and <i>Crangon crangon</i> community complex; Fine sand with <i>Spio martinensis</i> community complex in a natural condition.</p>	<p>The release of contaminated surface water run-off or an accidental pollution event during construction or operation could affect surface water downstream in Dublin Bay.</p>	<p>Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality are outlined within section 7.1.4 and include but are not limited to the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.</p> <p>Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.</p> <p>Provision of temporary construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence.</p> <p>Fuels to be stored in bunded areas, management of construction related traffic etc.</p> <p>Implementation of SUDs when complete to control</p>
<b>Annual vegetation of drift lines</b>	<p>Restore the favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat - extent/structure/distribution/ composition. Maintain presence of sea rocket (<i>Cakile maritima</i>), sea sandwort (<i>Honckenya peploides</i>), prickly saltwort (<i>Salsola kali</i>) and oraches (<i>Atriplex</i> spp.)</p>		
<b>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand</b>	<p>Restore the favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat - extent/vegetation structure/distribution/ Composition/variation and no significant expansion of common cordgrass.</p>		
<b>Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae</i>)</b>	<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat, community,</p>		

<b>Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi)</b>	extent/vegetation structure of habitat & physical structure /distribution		run off during the operation of the scheme.
<b>Embryonic shifting dunes</b>	To restore the favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat – area/distribution/physical structure/vegetation structure and composition.	The introduction and/or spread of invasive species to downstream European sites could potentially result in the degradation of existing habitats present, in particular coastal habitats not permanently or regularly inundated by seawater. These species may outcompete other native species present, negatively impacting the species composition, diversity and abundance and the physical structural integrity of the habitat.	See the mitigation measures described in Section 7.1.4 to prevent the introduction and/or spread of invasive species which includes the carrying out of preconstruction surveys and the implementation of an Invasive Species management plan.
<b>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes)</b>			
<b>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes)</b>			
<b>Humid dune slacks</b>			
<b>Petalophyllum ralfsii (Petalwort)</b>	To maintain the favourable conservation condition in relation to distribution/ population size/ habitat / hydrological conditions/ vegetation structure.		See the mitigation measures described in Section 7.1.4 for site specific measures for Construction Compounds. Silt fences / soil 'bunds' or infiltration trenches will be installed and maintained.
<p><b>Overall conclusion: Integrity test</b></p> <p>The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation, the construction and operation of this proposed development alone or in combination with other plans and projects will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects can be excluded for North Dublin Bay SAC. No wetland habitat loss will occur. Adverse effects from water contamination and sediment release can be effectively prevented by mitigation measures ensuring the protection of the Poddle_010 and combined sewer discharging to Ringsend WwTP (which ultimately discharges to Liffey Estuary Lower, Dublin Bay). No increase in existing runoff rates will occur and appropriate treatment will ensure runoff quality.</p> <p>The spread of invasive species can also be controlled via mitigation measures, pre confirmatory surveys will be carried out in order to avoid or adequately treat or remove invasive plants prior to construction being carried out in accordance with the Invasive Species Management Plan appended to the NIS.</p>			

Based on the information submitted, surveys carried out analysis provided I am satisfied that no uncertainty remains.

**The proposed development would not delay or prevent the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the North Dublin Bay SAC.**

**Table 3: AA summary matrix for South Dublin Bay SAC**

South Dublin Bay SAC [000210]			
Detailed Conservation Objectives available: <a href="#">ConservationObjectives.rdl (npws.ie)</a>			
Summary of Appropriate Assessment			
Qualifying Interest feature	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures
	Maintain favourable conservation condition	An accidental pollution event during construction or operation could affect surface water downstream in Dublin Bay. An accidental pollution event of a sufficient magnitude, either alone or cumulatively with other pollution sources, could affect the quality of the intertidal habitats and the fauna communities they support.	Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality are outlined within section 7.1.4. and include but are not limited to the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.
<b>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</b>	Maintain favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat area, community extent/vegetation structure/distribution including Zostera dominated community and fine sands with Angulus tenuis		Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.  Provision of temporary

<b>Annual vegetation of drift lines</b>	Restore favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat area, distribution, physical structure, vegetation structure and composition		construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence. Fuels to be stored in bunded areas, management of construction related traffic.
<b>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand</b>	Restore favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat area, distribution, physical structure, vegetation structure and composition		See the mitigation measures described in Section 7.1.4 for site specific measures for Construction Compounds. Silt trenches / soil 'bunds' or infiltration trenches will be installed and maintained.
<b>Embryonic shifting dunes</b>	Restore favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat area, distribution, physical structure, vegetation structure and composition	Spread of invasive species could potentially result in the degradation of existing habitats present, in particular coastal habitats not permanently or regularly inundated by seawater. These species may outcompete other native species present, negatively impacting the species composition, diversity and abundance and the physical structural integrity of the habitat.	See the mitigation measures described in Section 7.1.4 to prevent the introduction and/or spread of invasive species which includes the carrying out of preconstruction surveys and the implementation of an Invasive Species management plan.  Implementation of SUDs when complete to control

			run off during the operation of the scheme.
<p><b>Overall conclusion: Integrity test</b></p> <p>The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation, the construction and operation of this proposed development alone or in combination with other plans and projects will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects can be excluded for South Dublin Bay SAC. No wetland habitat loss will occur. Adverse effects from water contamination and sediment release can be effectively prevented by mitigation measures ensuring the protection of the Poddle_010 and combined sewer discharging to Ringsend WwTP (which ultimately discharges to Liffey Estuary Lower, Dublin Bay). No increase in existing runoff rates will occur and appropriate treatment will ensure runoff quality. The spread of invasive species can also be controlled via mitigation measures, pre confirmatory surveys will be carried out in order to avoid or adequately treat or remove invasive plants prior to construction being carried out in accordance with the Invasive Species Management Plan appended to the NIS.</p> <p>Based on the information submitted, surveys carried out analysis provided I am satisfied that no uncertainty remains.</p> <p><b>The proposed development would not delay or prevent the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the South Dublin Bay SAC.</b></p>			

**Table 4: AA summary matrix for Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC**

Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC [003000]			
Detailed Conservation Objectives available: <a href="#">ConservationObjectives.rdl (npws.ie)</a>			
Summary of Appropriate Assessment			
Qualifying Interest feature	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures
Reefs	Maintain favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat area, distribution and community structure.	An accidental pollution event during construction or operation could affect surface water downstream in Dublin Bay. An accidental pollution event of a sufficient magnitude, either along or cumulatively with other pollution sources, could potentially affect the quality (vegetation structure and composition) and area/distribution of intertidal/coastal habitats.	Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality are outlined within section 7.1.4 and include but are not limited to: the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.  Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.  Provision of temporary construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence.
Harbour porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition in relation to access to suitable habitat and prevention of disturbance by human activity.	Pollution event could potentially affect the quality of the intertidal /marine habitats which support harbour	Fuels to be stored in bunded areas, management of

		porpoise and fish prey species.	construction related traffic etc.  Implementation of SUDs when complete to control run off during the operation of the scheme.
<p><b>Overall conclusion: Integrity test</b></p> <p>The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of this proposed development alone or in combination with other plans and projects will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects can be excluded for Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC. No habitat loss will occur. Adverse effects from water contamination and sediment release can be effectively prevented by mitigation measures ensuring the protection of the the Poddle_010 and combined sewer discharging to Ringsend WwTP (which ultimately discharges to Liffey Estuary Lower, Dublin Bay). No increase in existing runoff rates will occur and appropriate treatment will ensure runoff quality.</p> <p>Based on the information submitted, surveys carried out and analysis provided I am satisfied that no uncertainty remains.</p> <p><b>The proposed development would not delay or prevent the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC.</b></p>			

**Table 5 AA Summary matrix for Lambay Island SAC**

<p><b>Lambay Island SAC [000204]</b></p> <p><b>Detailed Conservation Objectives available:</b> <a href="#">ConservationObjectives.rdl (npws.ie)</a></p>				
<b>Summary of Appropriate Assessment</b>				
<b>Qualifying feature</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
Reefs		To maintain favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat area/distribution/community complex and subtidal reef community complex in natural condition.	No pathway for impacts to occur on any habitats associated with this SAC as it is located a significant	None.



		distance from the proposed scheme on the far side of the Howth peninsula and separated by a large marine waterbody.	
Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coast.	To maintain favourable conservation condition in relation to habitat length; no decline in habitat distribution; no alteration to natural functioning of geomorphological and hydrological processes; maintain range of sea cliff habitat zonations; maintain structural variation within sward; maintain range of Irish Sea Cliff Survey species; negative indicator species less than 5%; and cover of bracken and woody species on grassland/heath less than 10% and 20% respectively	As Above	
Halichoerus grypus (Grey Seal)	No restriction of species range by artificial barriers to site use; breeding, moulting and resting haul-out sites maintained in natural condition; and human activities should occur at levels that do not adversely affect the species at the site.	Pollution event could potentially affect the quality of the intertidal /marine habitats which support grey seal and harbour seal.	Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality are outlined within section 7.1.4 and include but are not limited to the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.
Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal)	No restriction of species range by artificial barriers to site use; breeding, moulting and resting haul-out sites maintained in natural condition; and human activities should occur at levels that do not adversely affect the species at the site.	<b>As Above</b>	Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems

			<p>and hence the downstream receiving water environment.</p> <p>Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality are outlined within section 7.1.4 and include but are not limited to: the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.</p> <p>Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.</p>
--	--	--	---

**Overall conclusion: Integrity test**

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of this proposed development alone or in combination with other plans and projects will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects can be excluded for Lambay Island SAC. No habitat loss will occur. Adverse effects from water contamination and sediment release can be effectively prevented by mitigation measures ensuring the protection of the Poddle\_010 and combined sewer discharging to Ringsend WwTP (which ultimately discharges to Liffey Estuary Lower, Dublin Bay). No increase in existing runoff rates will occur and appropriate treatment will ensure runoff quality.

Based on the information submitted, surveys carried out analysis provided I am satisfied that no uncertainty remains.

The proposed development would not delay or prevent the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the Lambay Island SAC.

Table 6: AA Summary matrix for North Bull Island SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, The Murrough SPA, and North West Irish Sea cSPA.

North Bull Island SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, The Murrough SPA, and North West Irish Sea cSPA.

Maintain or restore favourable conservation condition

Detailed Conservation Objectives available: <https://www.npws.ie>

North Bull Island SPA [004006],

Light-bellied Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla hrota*), Shelduck (*Tadorna tadorna*), Teal (*Anas crecca*), Pintail (*Anas acuta*), Shoveler (*Anas clypeata*), Oystercatcher (*Haematopus ostralegus*), Golden Plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*), Grey Plover (*Pluvialis squatarola*), Knot (*Calidris canutus*), Sanderling (*Calidris alba*), Dunlin (*Calidris alpina*), Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa*), Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*), Curlew (*Numenius arquata*), Redshank (*Tringa totanus*), Turnstone (*Arenaria interpres*), Black-headed Gull (*Chroicocephalus ridibundus*), Wetland and Waterbirds

#### Summary of Appropriate Assessment

Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures
<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of species and wetland habitat. Long term population trend stable or increasing.</p> <p>No significant decrease in distribution range, timing or intensity of use of areas by all the above-named species other than occurring from natural patterns of variation.</p> <p>The permanent area occupied by the wetland habitat should be stable and not significantly less than the area of 1,713 hectares, other</p>	<p>An accidental pollution event during construction could affect surface water downstream in Dublin Bay. An accidental pollution event of a sufficient magnitude, either alone or cumulatively with other pollution sources, could potentially affect the quality of the intertidal/coastal habitats that support the special conservation interest bird species of the SPA. This could potentially affect the use of habitat areas by birds and have long-term effects on the SPA populations.</p> <p>The introduction and/or spread of invasive species to</p>	<p>Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality are outlined within section 7.1.4 and include but are not limited to the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.</p> <p>Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.</p> <p>Provision of temporary construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence. Fuels</p>

than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.	downstream European sites could potentially result in the degradation of existing habitats present, in particular coastal habitats not permanently or regularly inundated by seawater. This in turn could affect the use of habitat areas by birds and have long-term effects on the SPA populations.	to be stored in bunded areas, management of construction related traffic etc. Implementation of SUDs when complete to control run off during the operation of the scheme.  See the mitigation measures described in Section 7.1.4 to prevent the introduction and/or spread of invasive species which includes the carrying out of preconstruction surveys and the implementation of an Invasive Species management plan,  Restore habitat after temporary loss.
---	---	--

#### **Baldoyle Bay SPA [004016]**

Light-bellied Brent Goose, Shelduck, Ringed Plover, Golden Plover, Grey Plover, Bar-tailed Godwit, and Wetland and Waterbirds.

#### **Summary of Appropriate assessment**

<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of species and wetland habitat.</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing</p> <p>Distribution / Range, timing and intensity of use of areas / No significant decrease in the range, timing and intensity of use of areas by all of the above named species, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation</p>	As above	As Above

#### **Dalkey Island SPA [004172]**

Roseate Tern, Common Tern, Artic Tern

#### **Summary of Appropriate assessment**

<b>Conservation Objectives</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------

<b>Targets and attributes (summary)</b>		
To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA	As Above	As Above
<b>Howth Head Coast SPA [004113]</b>  Kittiwake <i>Rissa tridactyla</i>		
<b>Summary of Appropriate assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA	As Above	As above
<b>South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA [004024]</b>  Light-bellied Brent Goose ( <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i> ), Oystercatcher ( <i>Haematopus ostralegus</i> ), Ringed Plover ( <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> ), Grey Plover* ( <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> ), Knot ( <i>Calidris canutus</i> ), Sanderling ( <i>Calidris alba</i> ), Dunlin ( <i>Calidris alpina</i> ), Bar-tailed Godwit ( <i>Limosa lapponica</i> ), Redshank ( <i>Tringa totanus</i> ), Black-headed Gull ( <i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i> ), Roseate Tern ( <i>Sterna dougallii</i> ), Common Tern ( <i>Sterna hirundo</i> ), Arctic Tern ( <i>Sterna paradisaea</i> ), Wetland and Waterbirds.  *Grey Plover ( <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> ) is proposed for removal from the list of SCI's for the site so no site specific conservation objective is included for the species		
<b>Summary of Appropriate assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
Long term pop trend stable or increasing Distribution - no significant decrease in range, timing or intensity of use of areas by wintering waterbirds No decline in roosting or breeding colonies. Human activities should occur at levels that do not	As Above	As Above

adversely affect breeding or roosting sites.		
<b>Irelands Eye SPA [0045117]</b>  Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i> , Herring Gull <i>Larus argentatus</i> , Kittiwake <i>Rissa tridactyla</i> , Guillemot <i>Uria aalge</i> , Razorbill <i>Alca torda</i> .		
<b>Summary of Appropriate assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA. Long term pop trend stable or increasing No significant decrease in range, timing or intensity of use of areas	An accidental pollution event of sufficient magnitude could affect the quality the of intertidal/coastal habitats that support the special conservation interest bird species of the SPA. This could potentially affect the use of habitat areas by birds and have long-term effects on the SPA populations.	As Above
<b>Malahide Estuary SPA [004025]</b>  Great Crested Grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus</i> , Light-bellied Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i> , Shelduck <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> , Pintail <i>Anas acuta</i> , Goldeneye <i>Bucephala clangula</i> , Red-breasted Merganser <i>Mergus serrator</i> , Oystercatcher <i>Haematopus ostralegus</i> , Golden Plover <i>Pluvialis apricaria</i> , Grey Plover <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> , Knot <i>Calidris canutus</i> , Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina</i> , Black-tailed Godwit <i>Limosa limosa</i> , Bar-tailed Godwit <i>Limosa lapponica</i> Redshank <i>Tringa tetanus</i> , Wetland and Waterbirds		
<b>Summary of Appropriate Assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of species and wetland habitat.  Long term population trend stable or increasing  No significant decrease in range, timing or intensity of use of areas.	As above	As Above

Habitat area / Hectares /The permanent area occupied by the wetland habitat should be stable and not significantly less than the area of 765ha, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.		
<b>Rogerstown Estuary SPA [004015]</b>  Greylag Goose <i>Anser anser</i> , Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i> , Shelduck <i>Tadorna tadorna</i> , Shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i> , Oystercatcher <i>Haematopus ostralegus</i> , Ringed Plover <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> , Grey Plover <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> , Knot <i>Calidris canutus</i> , Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina</i> , Black-tailed Godwit <i>Limosa limosa</i> , Redshank <i>Tringa tetanus</i> , Wetlands and Waterbirds.		
<b>Summary of Appropriate Assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
To maintain the favourable conservation condition of species and wetland habitat.  Long term population trend stable or increasing No significant decrease in range, timing or intensity of use of areas.  The permanent area occupied by the wetland habitat should be stable and not significantly less than the area of 646 hectares, other than that occurring from natural patterns of variation.	As Above	As Above
<b>Skerries Islands SPA [004122]</b>  Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i> , Shag <i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i> , Brent Goose <i>Branta Bernicla hrota</i> , Purple Sandpiper <i>Calidris maritima</i> , Turnstone <i>Arenaria interpres</i> , Herring Gull <i>Larus argentatus</i>		
<b>Summary of Appropriate Assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>

To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA.	As Above	As Above
<b>Lambay Island SPA [004069]</b>  Fulmar <i>Fulmarus glacialis</i> , Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i> , Shag <i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i> , Greylag Goose <i>Anser anser</i> , Lesser Black-backed Gull <i>Larus fuscus</i> , Herring Gull <i>Larus argentatus</i> , Kittiwake <i>Rissa tridactyla</i> , Guillemot <i>Uria aalge</i> , Razorbill <i>Alca torda</i> , Puffin <i>Fratercula arctica</i>		
<b>Summary of Appropriate Assessment</b>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
As Above	As Above	As Above
<b>Rockabill SPA [004014]</b>  Purple Sandpiper <i>Calidris maritima</i> , Roseate Tern <i>Sterna dougallii</i> , Common Tern <i>Sterna hirundo</i> , Arctic Tern <i>Sterna paradisaea</i>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
<p>To maintain the favourable conservation condition of bird species listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA.</p> <p>Long term population trend stable or increasing</p> <p>No significant decrease in range, timing or intensity of use of areas</p> <p>Human activities should occur at levels that do not adversely affect the breeding roseate tern population, the Common Tern population or the Arctic</p>	<p>An accidental pollution event during construction or operation could affect surface water downstream in Dublin Bay. An accidental pollution event of a sufficient magnitude, either along or cumulatively with other pollution sources, could potentially affect the quantity and quality of prey fish species and the quality and suitability of roosting sites within the SPA.</p> <p>Note Purple Sandpiper is located a significant distance from the proposed scheme and on the far side of the Howth</p>	<p>As Above in relation to water quality protection.</p> <p>The relevant mitigation measure described in Section 7.4.4.4 to avoid any potential disturbance related impacts on this SCI bird species during construction.</p>



Tern population – there should be no significant decline in these populations,	peninsula and is not at risk of significantly effects.	
<b>The Murrough SPA [004186]</b>  Red-throated, Diver <i>Gavia stellata</i> , Greylag Goose <i>Anser anser</i> , Light Bellied Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i> , Wigeon <i>Anas Penelope</i> , Teal <i>Anas crecca</i> , Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons</i> , Wetland and Waterbirds, Black-headed Gull <i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i> , Herring Gull <i>Larus argentatus</i>		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
<p>To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA.</p> <p>To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the wetland habitat at The Murrough SPA as a resource for the regularly occurring migratory waterbirds that utilise it.</p>	Similar concerns relating to water quality and the impact to habitats upon which the SCIs rely, as outlined in previous tables.	As outlined in previous tables in relation to protection of water quality.
<b>North West Irish Sea cSPA (004236)</b>  Red-throated Diver ( <i>Gavia stellata</i> ), Great Northern Diver ( <i>Gavia immer</i> ), Fulmar ( <i>Fulmarus glacialis</i> ), Manx Shearwater ( <i>Puffinus puffinus</i> ), Cormorant ( <i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i> ), Shag ( <i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i> ), Common Scoter ( <i>Melanitta nigra</i> ), Little Gull ( <i>Larus minutus</i> ), Black-headed Gull ( <i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i> ), Common Gull ( <i>Larus canus</i> ), Lesser Black-backed Gull ( <i>Larus fuscus</i> ), Herring Gull ( <i>Larus argentatus</i> ), Great Black-backed Gull ( <i>Larus marinus</i> ), Kittiwake ( <i>Rissa tridactyla</i> ), Roseate Tern ( <i>Sterna dougallii</i> ), Common Tern ( <i>Sterna hirundo</i> ), Arctic Tern ( <i>Sterna paradisaea</i> ), Little Tern ( <i>Sterna albifrons</i> ), Guillemot ( <i>Uria aalge</i> ), Razorbill ( <i>Alca torda</i> ), Puffin ( <i>Fratercula arctica</i> )		
<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures</b>
To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the bird species	An accidental pollution event during construction could affect surface water	Detailed pollution control measures to protect water quality

<p>listed as Special Conservation Interests for this SPA</p>	<p>downstream in Dublin Bay. An accidental pollution event of a sufficient magnitude, either alone or cumulatively with other pollution sources, could potentially affect the quality the of intertidal/coastal habitats that support the special conservation interest bird species of the SPA. This could potentially affect the use of habitat areas by birds and have long-term effects on the SPA populations.</p> <p>The introduction and/or spread of invasive species to downstream European sites could potentially result in the degradation of existing habitats present, in particular coastal habitats not permanently or regularly inundated by seawater. This in turn could affect the use of habitat areas by birds and have long-term effects on the SPA populations.</p>	<p>are outlined within section 7.1.4.1 and include but are not limited to: the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials.</p> <p>Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.</p> <p>Provision of temporary construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence. Fuels to be stored in bunded areas, management of construction related traffic etc.</p> <p>Implementation of SUDs when complete to control run off during the operation of the scheme.</p> <p>See the mitigation measures described in Section 7.1.4 to prevent the introduction and/or spread of invasive species which includes the carrying out of preconstruction surveys and the implementation of an Invasive Species management plan.</p>
--	--	---

#### Overall conclusion: Integrity test

The applicant determined that following detailed assessment of potential impacts and the implementation of mitigation, the construction and operation of this proposed development alone or in combination with other plans and projects will not adversely affect the integrity of these European sites in view of the conservation objectives of those sites.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects can be excluded for these SPA sites and that no effects of any significance will occur.

No habitat loss within the European designated sites will occur. Adverse effects from water contamination and sediment release can be effectively prevented by mitigation measures ensuring the protection of the Poddle\_010 and combined sewer discharging to Ringsend WwTP (which ultimately discharges to Liffey Estuary Lower, Dublin Bay). No increase in existing runoff rates will occur and appropriate treatment will ensure runoff quality.

The spread of invasive species can also be controlled via mitigation measures, pre confirmatory surveys will be carried out in order to avoid or adequately treat or remove invasive plants prior to construction being carried out in accordance with an Invasive Species Management Plan.

Therefore, based on the information submitted, surveys carried out and analysis provided I am satisfied that no uncertainty remains.

**The proposed development would not delay or prevent the attainment of the Conservation objectives of any of these SPA sites in Dublin Bay and beyond.**

### **Potential for Adverse effects**

- 7.39. As outlined above the potential for adverse effects relates to the changes to water quality arising from pollution and sedimentation of watercourses arising at various locations and associated with various operations during the construction of the development and the deterioration of habitats and/or sedimentation arising from the spread of invasive plant species.
- 7.40. It is important to reiterate at this juncture that no works will take place within the boundary of any Natura 2000 site and as such the potential for direct effects does not arise.
- 7.41. The Zol for disturbance associated with general construction activities for wintering birds, disturbance effects would not be expected to extend beyond a distance of approximately 300m. There are no European sites within this Zol.
- 7.42. As highlighted above in Tables 2 – 6, in the absence of mitigation, there are European sites at risk of ex-situ habitat losses.
- 7.43. The Proposed Scheme is hydrologically connected to the Liffey Estuary Upper via the River Poddle and the Liffey Estuary Lower via the Grand Canal and Ringsend Wastewater Treatment Plant (WwTP). There are twelve crossing points of the River Poddle, the majority of which are in sections where the Poddle is culverted. The River Poddle is above ground at Poddle Park, Mt Argus Park and Ravensdale Park. The Proposed Scheme crosses the Grand Canal at Robert Emmet Bridge along the Harold's Cross Road R137.
- 7.44. I note that these watercourses lie within the typical territorial ranges of otters, and an otter spraint was identified on the ledge underneath Emmet Bridge. However, the nearest European site for which this species is designated is the Wicklow Mountains SAC, which is located approximately 8.1km south (as the crow flies) of the Proposed

Scheme. Otter territories are within the range of approximately 7.5km for females and can reach up to 21 km for males via hydrological pathways (O' Neill et al., 2009). The River Dodder and Liffey Estuary, however, provide the key pathway to Wicklow Mountains SAC, whereas the Proposed Scheme will discharge to the River Poddle (Poddle\_010) and Ringsend WwTP. Although Wicklow Mountains SAC is located within the same sub-catchment (Dodder\_SC\_010) to the Proposed Scheme, the River Poddle and River Dodder are not hydrologically connected and are separated by approximately 600m of urbanised areas at their closest point at Bancroft Park. As such, populations of otter within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme are deemed not to be connected to the SAC population.

- 7.45. In addition to the forgoing, I also consider it important to examine the potential for impacts to arise in relation to noise and vibration disturbance arising from construction works and in relation to air quality deterioration arising from both construction works and the operational phase of the development.

#### Noise & Vibration Disturbance

- 7.46. Potential adverse effects in relation to noise disturbance and vibration have been examined by the applicant within the NIS and are not considered to be likely to give rise to significant adverse effect due to the distance of Natura 2000 sites and known ex-situ sites from the proposed works. Effects would not be expected beyond 150m for mammals such as otter and 300m for wintering birds. It is stated that noise levels arising from construction would attenuate to existing background noise levels at that distance and there are no European sites within the disturbance ZoI of the Proposed Scheme.
- 7.47. There are two sites where water bodies may be subject to significant disturbance as a consequence of the Proposed Scheme. These sites are located at the proposed Poddle Cycleway and Stone Boat Boardwalk at Mount Argus View and the proposed offline footbridges at the existing Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal.
- Construction of the new Stone Boat Boardwalk over Poddle at Mount Argus Way

- Cycle / Pedestrian Bridge to the West of the Robert Emmet Bridgen over Grand Canal and
- Pedestrian Bridge to East of Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal.

#### Stone Boat Boardwalk at Mount Argus Way

- 7.48. The proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk will provide a footway / cycleway link between the rear of the car park on Sundrive Road to Mount Argus Way. The boardwalk will be approximately 40m long and 4m wide and will be constructed at a varying level of approximately 3m above the level of the river channel bed. The finished surface level of the bridge will match the level of the existing car park and the road surface at Mount Argus Square. A section of the existing boundary wall to the rear of the car park will be demolished to allow connectivity onto the proposed boardwalk.
- 7.49. The proposed structure will be supported on continuous flight auger (CFA) bored piles that will be installed into the River Poddle riverbank. The length of the piles has been estimated to be approximately 10m, with an approximate diameter of 500mm.
- 7.50. Each pile will support a transverse primary steel beam, which will in turn be connected by a row of four secondary steel beams positioned in a longitudinal direction along the length of the structure. The steel beams will support the steel deck which will be finished in perforated metal with a slip resistant finish. A steel post and wire railing will be provided along the edge of the boardwalk, closest to the River Poddle.
- 7.51. The underside of the boardwalk structure will have a vertical clearance of approximately 0.6m to the top of the Stone Boat feature in the river channel adjoining to the east. The positioning of the CFA piles finished level of the boardwalk will not affect the operation of the existing box culvert that extends beneath the car park adjacent to Sundrive Road.
- 7.52. Access to the works area will be provided mainly from the car park at Sundrive Road, with a secondary access from the existing road at Mount Argus Way. Protective measures will be provided to prevent materials falling into the River Poddle and prefabricated elements of the proposed boardwalk will be delivered to

the works location from the southern end. CFA piles will be installed using a piling rig from the car park at the Mount Argus Square apartments where a part of the car park will be acquired temporarily for this purpose.

- 7.53. The ground surface will be prepared, with minor excavations to achieve the piling level. Bored pile drilling will be completed. Steel pile casings will be pushed down as the auger bores the hole. Steel cases will be adopted to prevent leakage of concrete into the river. As the auger withdraws, concrete will be pumped into the hole and finally reinforcement cages pushed into the concrete. The drilling / piling activity will be completed over a period of approximately two weeks, with one to two piles installed per day.
- 7.54. The steel beam sections will be lifted into place by a mobile crane and connected to the piles. It is expected that the crane will be positioned within the car park on Sundrive Road, with a second smaller crane located in the car park at Mount Argus Square to assist in stabilising the lifting process. Once the steel beams have been connected, the metal deck will be lifted into place and fastened before the railing is installed. Reinstatement of adjacent areas will then be completed.

Cycle / Pedestrian Bridge to the West of the Robert Emmet Bridge & Pedestrian Bridge to East of Robert Emmet Bridge

- 7.55. A new footbridge is proposed on the western side that will carry pedestrians and two lanes of cycle traffic that will be displaced from Robert Emmet Bridge as a result of the provision of bus lanes on the main carriageway. The footbridge will be approximately 24m long spanning the Grand Canal, and 6m wide including glass panels to provide edge protection and will provide a 5m clearance width for the footway and cycleway. The clearance of the bridge over the Grand Canal water level will be approximately 3.2m, similar to the existing Robert Emmet Bridge. A section of the existing parapet wall adjacent to Parnell Road will be removed to allow access onto the new footbridge.
- 7.56. A new footbridge is proposed on the eastern side, that will carry pedestrians displaced from Robert Emmet Bridge as a result of the provision of bus lanes on the

main carriageway. The footbridge will be approximately 25m long spanning the Grand Canal. The bridge will be 3.5m wide, including glass panels to provide edge protection, and will provide a 2.5m clearance width for the footway. The clearance of the bridge over the Grand Canal water level will be approximately 3.2m, similar to the existing Robert Emmet Bridge. A section of the existing retaining wall adjacent to Grove Road and Windsor Terrace will be removed to allow construction of the new bridge.

- 7.57. The proposed structures will be independently supported by reinforced concrete abutments and intermediate steel piers. Longitudinal and transverse steel beams will support the deck surface that will be constructed in perforated steel sheets, to provide water-permeable surfaces.
- 7.58. Each of the abutments and intermediate piers will be supported on pairs of CFA piles, up to 13m long and 500mm in diameter. The ground surface will be prepared, with minor excavations to achieve the piling level. Prefabricated structural elements will be delivered to the works location. Bored pile drilling will be completed. Steel pile casings will be pushed down as the augur bores the hole. Steel cases will be installed to prevent leakage of concrete in the canal. As the auger withdraws, concrete will be pumped into the hole and finally reinforcement cages pushed into the concrete. The drilling / piling activity will be completed over a period of approximately two weeks, with one to two piles installed per day.
- 7.59. Reinforced concrete pile caps will be constructed at the top of the piles which will support the reinforced concrete abutments and steel piers. The abutments on both the northern and southern sides of the bridge will be constructed and the steel piers delivered to site, lifted by crane and fastened in place.
- 7.60. The bridge decks will be completed last. The steel decks will be transported to site and lifted into place by crane, from the northern side of the canal.
- 7.61. Glass panel edge protection will be provided on each side of the bridge structures and surface finishes applied to the bridge decks. Reinstatement of adjacent areas will then be completed.

7.62. Areas within the Proposed Scheme, which will be subject to construction activities which generate noise levels greater than 50dB (e.g. piling, etc.), include proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges over the Grand Canal at Robert Emmet Bridge and the construction of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk along the River Poddle by Mount Argus Way. These activities will result in a greater magnitude of effect on the baseline environment. As a result, noise and vibration from construction works at these locations, will have the potential to result in the reduced breeding success of breeding bird species breeding in the vicinity of the works. Breeding birds will be temporarily displaced during the construction works. The area over which disturbance / displacement effects will occur, form a relatively small part of larger expanses of similar habitat types in the wider locality of the Grand Canal (i.e. both upstream and downstream sections of the Grand Canal). As such, given the availability of suitable habitat in the wider locality of the Proposed Scheme, the construction works are therefore not likely to affect the conservation status of breeding birds and will not result in a likely significant negative effect, above the local scale. Although it is not possible to quantify the magnitude of this potential impact (or the potential effect zone) it could potentially extend for several hundred metres from the Proposed Scheme. The results of noise modelling carried out for the Proposed Scheme confirmed that at 150m, noise levels for all construction activities will be below 60dB (see Chapter 9 (Noise & Vibration) of the EIAR). Given the temporary to short-term nature of the construction works, coupled with the existing levels of disturbance within these urban areas, disturbance or displacement effects associated with the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme will also be over the short-term. Therefore, these impacts will not affect the conservation status of breeding bird species and will not result in a likely significant negative effect, above the local scale.

#### Disturbance and Displacement Otter

7.63. No otter holts were identified during the surveys undertaken, however, aquatic surveys recorded a single otter spraint on the ledge underneath the Emmet Bridge in July 2022. Whilst the results of the desk study did not reveal the location of any otter



holts in close proximity to the Proposed Scheme, and the field surveys undertaken did not record any otter holts within the boundary of the Proposed Scheme, it is reasonable to assume that active otter holts are present along stretches of the Grand Canal, and potentially upstream overground sections of the River Poddle. In addition, otter frequently use the Lower Liffey Estuary, to which the Proposed Scheme is hydrologically connected, for commuting and foraging purposes, with holts identified at Dublin Port (Macklin et al. 2019).

- 7.64. Increased human presence and / or noise and vibration associated with construction works within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme is unlikely to affect these holts. However, construction works associated with the Proposed Scheme have the potential to (at least temporarily) displace commuting or foraging otter.
- 7.65. Construction activities at the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk over the River Poddle will include 13 bored piles. In addition, the construction of the proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges either side of the Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal will involve 12 bored piles. Noise and vibrations associated with the construction of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk and proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges, as well as construction works in close proximity to the River Poddle in Mount Argus Park and Poddle Park, will have the potential to create disturbance and displacement within the vicinity of the works. Noise and disturbance levels as a result of construction of the Stone Boat Boardwalk range from approximately 80dB at 10m from the proposed works to 52dB at 250m, with the indicative predicted cumulative noise level for these works at the closest noise sensitive location in the order of 77dB in the absence of any noise mitigation. Baseline noise levels in this vicinity are approximately 49dB. Therefore, during construction of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk noise levels will return close to baseline levels as a distance of approximately 250m. Noise and disturbance levels as a result of the construction of the proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges range from 70dB to 80dB at the closest noise sensitive location, in the absence of any noise mitigation. Baseline noise levels in this vicinity are approximately 69dB and therefore, during construction of the proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges noise levels will return close to baseline levels as a distance of

approximately 30m. Considering the above, disturbance for mammals is estimated to reach up to 250m from the Proposed Scheme. As active otter holts are outside of this ZoI, disturbance effects from the Proposed Scheme are not deemed to cause displacement affects leading to abandonment of holts.

- 7.66. Otter are known to tolerate human disturbance under certain circumstances (Bailey and Rochford 2006; The Environment Agency 2010; Irish Wildlife Trust 2012). There are numerous records of otter within the urban Dublin area, which suggests a relatively high level of habituation to human disturbance and noise by otter (Macklin et al. 2019). As construction works will typically be undertaken during normal daylight working hours and otter are generally nocturnal in habit, and that otter can (in many circumstances) tolerate high levels of human presence and disturbance, displacement of otter from their habitat is extremely unlikely to affect the local otter population. Therefore, disturbance during construction is not likely to have a significant effect on the species' conservation status and will not result in a likely significant negative effect, at any geographic scale.
- 7.67. Disturbance and displacement effects on otter may also be the result of increased artificial lighting during construction. Nocturnal mammals, such as otter, are likely to be disturbed by the introduction of artificial light into established breeding and foraging areas (Rich and Longcore 2005). Although the majority of the Proposed Scheme corridor is already lit artificially, the proposal may result in the introduction of artificial lighting to previously unlit areas, if the proposed Construction Compounds
- 7.68. require security lighting for the duration of construction. Given the fact that the locations of proposed Construction Compounds are remote from any watercourses, with the exception of Construction Compound K1 off Sundrive Road which is located directly adjacent to the River Poddle where existing street lighting will be utilised, lighting during construction is not considered likely to result in any significant effect to otter in the vicinity.

#### Disturbance and Displacement Badgers

- 7.69. In conjunction with any displacement effects associated with foraging habitat loss, increased human presence and / or noise and vibration associated with the Construction Phase, the Proposed Scheme has the potential to displace badgers from both breeding / resting places and from foraging habitat located beyond the footprint of the Proposed Scheme.
- 7.70. As construction works in areas of suitable foraging habitat will typically be undertaken during normal daylight working hours and as badgers are nocturnal in habit, displacement of badgers from foraging areas (outside of areas where foraging habitat will be lost as a result of the Proposed Scheme) is extremely unlikely to affect the local badger population and will not result in a likely significant negative effect, at any geographic scale. In addition, badgers residing within the wider study area are likely to be habituated to disturbance within the urban environment and therefore would be less sensitive to very localised, temporary increases in disturbance.
- 7.71. Disturbance and displacement effects on badger may also be the result of increased artificial lighting during construction. Nocturnal mammals, such as badger, are likely to be disturbed by the introduction of artificial light into established breeding and foraging areas (Rich and Longcore 2005). Although the majority of the Proposed Scheme corridor is already lit artificially, the proposal may result in the introduction of artificial lighting to previously unlit areas, if the proposed Construction Compounds require security lighting for the duration of construction. Two of the three locations proposed for Construction Compounds are located in areas of adjacent suitable foraging habitat for badger (amenity grassland and scattered trees and parkland). If high-intensity, non-directional security lighting (e.g. floodlighting) is installed at these proposed Construction Compounds, light spill into adjacent areas could render these areas unsuitable for foraging badger. Therefore, lighting associated with the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme could result in a negative effect on badgers, albeit temporary in nature and significant at the local level only.
- 7.72. Where deemed necessary, a suitably qualified licensed ecologist(s), engaged by the appointed contractor, will ensure that lighting at the Construction Compounds and in active work areas, which are in close proximity to watercourses with known bat,

otter, badger activity, will be designed to minimise light spill and be cognisant of downward light-spill onto watercourses.

7.73. Mitigation measures to reduce light spill will include the following:

- The use of sensor / timer triggered lighting;
- LED luminaires to be used where possible due to their sharp cut-off, lower intensity, good colour rendition and dimming capability;
- Column heights to be considered to minimise light spill; and
- Accessories such as baffles, hoods or louvres can be used to reduce light spill and direct it only where needed.

7.74. Where night-time works are required, the appointed contractor will liaise with the engaged suitably experienced and qualified ecologist(s) and implement measures to mitigate the impact of such works (especially works carried out adjacent to watercourses with known bat, otter, badger activity).

#### Air Quality deterioration

7.75. In addition to the foregoing, consideration was given to the potential for adverse effects to occur in relation to habitat degradation as a result of air quality. I note that it is stated within the NIS that the unmitigated Zol for air quality effects arising from the Proposed Scheme has the potential to extend 50m from the Proposed Scheme boundary, and 500m from construction compounds during the construction phase, and up to 200m of the Proposed Scheme boundary during the operational phase. There are no European sites present within these distances.

#### Habitat loss and fragmentation

7.76. As mentioned previously above no wintering bird surveys were carried out for the Proposed Scheme, as no European sites or ex-situ sites supporting wintering birds will be subject to habitat loss from the Proposed Scheme.

7.77. The Proposed Scheme lies within 60m of the known wintering bird feeding site of Eamonn Ceannt Park. However, the Proposed Scheme will not result in habitat loss and will be separated from Eamonn Ceannt Park by an existing row of 2-storey houses

along Sundrive Road and by existing vegetation and trees along the perimeter of the preferred amenity grassland feeding areas (playing pitches) within the Park, which provide significant screening to the adjacent Park. The proposed works in this area of Sundrive Road are considered to be minor, including provision of a cycleway and retention of existing surfaces.

- 7.78. As the subject scheme will not result in the loss of sites suitable to support breeding gull and wintering bird species, there is no potential for impacts on SCI species associated with SPAs to occur as a result of habitat loss / fragmentation and there is no potential for in combination effects to occur.

Habitat degradation/effects on QI/SCI species as a result of hydrological impacts

- 7.79. The Proposed Scheme will cross the Grand Canal and the River Poddle (via existing crossing points), both providing hydrological connectivity to Dublin Bay through the Liffey Estuary Upper and Lower. The Proposed Scheme is hydrologically connected to Dublin Bay via the River Poddle (Poddle\_010), Grand Canal Main Line and Liffey Estuary Upper and Liffey Estuary Lower, as well as a network of interconnecting and established surface or combined sewer / surface water pipes which discharge via Ringsend WwTP.
- 7.80. The construction of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk across the River Poddle will involve bored piles into the vegetated bank set back from the River Poddle. The area will be accessed via Sundrive Carpark and Mount Argus View involving a piling rig and a crane for a period of 6 weeks. Widening of the Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal will involve bored piles into existing made ground set back from the canal. The area will be accessed from Gordons Fuels. In addition, construction at the Grand Canal requires works near an existing high voltage (220kV (kilovolt)) oil-filled underground cable. If damaged during works, oil could enter the Grand Canal. This has the potential to result in significant negative effects on water quality and consequently affect aquatic and wetland habitats in the receiving environment. In a worst-case albeit unlikely scenario, coastal habitats downstream, in Dublin Bay, could also be affected.

- 7.81. In a potential worst case scenario, the release of contaminated surface water runoff and / or an accidental spillage or pollution event into any surface water features during construction, or operation, also has the potential to affect SCI bird species and QI mammal species that commute, forage and loaf in Dublin Bay i.e bird species associated with Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Lambay Island SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Rogerstown SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Murrough SPA and marine mammals associated with Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC and Lambay Island SAC.
- 7.82. Whilst these watercourses lie within the typical territorial ranges of otters, none of them share any hydrological connection to the Wicklow Mountains SAC. It is the River Dodder which provides the key hydrological pathway between the Wicklow Mountains SAC and Dublin City. Given the separation which exists between the Wicklow Mountains SAC and the Proposed Scheme, the otter population in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme is regarded to be distinct to that of the SAC. Therefore, habitat degradation / effects on the QI otter population for Wicklow Mountains SAC, as a result of hydrological impacts by the Proposed Scheme, can be excluded.
- 7.83. There is the possibility for significant effects on the following European sites, in the absence of mitigation, either arising from the project alone, or in combination with other plans and projects, as a result of hydrological impacts, hydrogeological impacts, invasive species and disturbance and displacement impacts: North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Lambay Island SAC, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, Rockabill SPA, The Murrough SPA and North West Irish Sea cSPA.
- 7.84. Whilst these watercourses lie within the typical territorial ranges of otters, none of them share any hydrological connection to the Wicklow Mountains SAC. It is the River Dodder which provides the key hydrological pathway between the Wicklow Mountains SAC and Dublin City. Given the separation which exists between the Wicklow

Mountains SAC and the Proposed Scheme, the otter population in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme is regarded to be distinct to that of the SAC. Therefore, habitat degradation / effects on the QI otter population for Wicklow Mountains SAC, as a result of hydrological impacts by the Proposed Scheme, can be excluded.

Habitat degradation as a result of introducing/ spreading Non-Native invasive species

- 7.85. Although no non-native invasive species were recorded during field surveys, records of invasive species in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme were returned from the desk study. Therefore, there is potential for invasive species to spread or be introduced, during construction, to terrestrial habitat areas in European sites downstream in Dublin Bay (i.e. North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and North West Irish Sea cSPA). These in turn may result in the degradation of the existing habitats, in particular those habitats not permanently or regularly inundated by seawater, potentially outcompeting other native species and affecting species compositive and physical structure of the habitat. Therefore, it is possible that the spread / introduction of invasive species could undermine the conservation objectives of these European sites.
- 7.86. However, it is considered unlikely that invasive species could spread to European sites which are located a significant distance from the outfall locations of the Liffey Estuary Lower, such as Howth Head SAC, Howth Head Coast SPA, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC and Dalkey Islands SPA.

In combination Effects

- 7.87. In combination effects are examined within section 9 of the NIS submitted. The proposed works were considered in combination with all plans and/or projects with the potential to impact upon the European sites outlined above, I have also considered the North West Irish Sea cSPA in my consideration of in combination effects. Such plans and projects included any national, regional and local land use plans or any existing or proposed projects (that were in place at the time of lodgement of the

proposed scheme for the consideration of the Board) that could potentially affect the ecological environment within the ZOI of the Proposed Scheme and are listed in Table 30: 'Land Use Plans and Projects Considered for the In-Combination Assessment', Table 31: 'In Combination Assessment of Plans and Programmes' and Table 32 'In Combination Assessment of Major Projects' of the NIS submitted. Each plan and project has been individually considered for any potential in combination effects.

- 7.88. It is of note that the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 was adopted at a Special Council meeting on the 2nd of November 2022. The plan came into effect on the 14th of December 2022. The consultation period for the proposed scheme was carried out under the previous plan, however, the application was lodged under the current 2022 – 2028 plan and has been assessed with regard to this plan. I have had regard to the current Development Plan for the purpose of assessing the potential for cumulative effects in relation to the proposed development and note that any new issues, as a result of the Development Plan change during the consultation period, have been considered.
- 7.89. It is important to note at this juncture that concerns have been raised within the submissions received in relation to the potential for in combination effects with regard to other significant infrastructure projects in and around the city such as adjoining CBC projects, Luas extension projects and Metrolink. All such projects have been considered in the context of in combination effects and it is important to note that such projects must comply with all applicable planning and environmental approval requirements and be in accordance with the objectives and policies of the relevant land use plans (Development Plans, Local Area Plans etc.). Considering the environmental protection policies included within the relevant land use plans, the range of mitigation measures included in the Proposed Scheme to avoid significant impacts and that alone the Proposed Scheme will not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites, I am satisfied that the Metrolink and other such projects will not act in combination with the Proposed Scheme to have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European sites.



- 7.90. The in-combination assessment within Section 9.1 of the NIS (Table 32) submitted has concluded that there is no potential for adverse effects on the integrity of any European sites including those within its Zol, to arise as a consequence of the Proposed Scheme in-combination with any other plans or projects.
- 7.91. In the interest of clarity, it is important to note that all other bus connect routes have been considered in the assessment of cumulative effects. Given the nature of the proposed works and the standard nature of the proposed mitigation measures I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to cumulative impacts of any significance.
- 7.92. The 'conclusion of in-combination assessment' within Section 9.3 of the NIS submitted has concluded that there is no potential for adverse effects on the integrity of any European sites including those within its Zol, to arise as a consequence of the Proposed Scheme in-combination with any other plans or projects.
- 7.93. Mitigation measures detailed in Section 8 of the NIS and summarised within Table 7 below will ensure that no adverse effects on European sites integrity will arise from the implementation of the Proposed Scheme.
- 7.94. The implementation of, and adherence to, the policies and objectives of the relevant plans set out in Section 9.2 of the NIS and those of the current Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 will ensure the protection of European sites across all identified potential impact pathways and will include the requirement for any future project to undergo Screening for Appropriate Assessment and/or Appropriate Assessment, as appropriate.
- 7.95. As the Proposed Scheme will not affect the integrity of European sites within the Zol of the Proposed Scheme, and given the protection afforded to European sites under the overarching land use plans, I am satisfied that there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of any European sites to arise as a consequence of the Proposed Scheme acting in-combination with any other plans or projects.
- 7.96. Overall, I am satisfied that the NIS and supplementary information provided as part of the application has examined the potential for all impact mechanisms in terms of the conservation objectives of the North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC,

Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Lambay Island SAC, Howth Head Coast SPA, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, North West Irish Sea cSPA, and The Murrough SPA. The potential for adverse effects can be effectively ameliorated by both design-based and applied mitigation measures related to surface water quality and spread of invasive species.

### **Mitigation Measures and Monitoring**

7.97. A summary of mitigation measures is presented in the tables above. Full details are provided in the NIS, Construction Management Plan and Invasive Species Management Plan and summarised below. I consider that all measures proposed are implementable and will be effective in their stated aims. Furthermore, an Ecological Clerk of Works will be employed to ensure that measures are implemented as prescribed. A summary of mitigation measures is presented in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: Summary of Mitigation Measures to avoid adverse effects on European Sites**

Measures to protect surface water quality and groundwater quality during construction:	All necessary consents will be obtained from the relevant regulator (such as IFI, OPW or the local authority), as appropriate. Bank stabilisation and erosion protection, if required, will be designed in consultation with the IFI and NPWS. The area of disturbance of the bank will be the absolute minimum required. Use of silt traps, silt fences, bunds for run off to collect in, good construction practice in relation to concrete use and wash out on site. The use of bunded areas, secured areas for hazardous materials, fuels, lubricants
--	---

	<p>and use of spill kits. The use of onsite treatment for surface water runoff, use of settlement tanks/ponds and management of same. Monitoring of water bodies.</p> <p>Provision of temporary construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence.</p> <p>Fuels to be stored in bunded areas, and management of construction related traffic.</p>
Measures to protect surface water quality during operation:	Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) including bioretention areas and filtration drains water butts and permeable paving.
Measures to eradicate/control the spread of non-native invasive species	Preconstruction survey, implementation of an invasive species management plan and post construction monitoring programme.
Measures to protect birds/ mammals from direct injury/ mortality	Preconstruction otter survey; night working within/ directly adjacent to watercourses where otter are known to commute will preferably not be undertaken; open excavations will be covered when not in use and backfilled as soon as practicable; and excavations will also be covered at night, where practicable, and any deep excavations

	which must be left open will have appropriate egress ramps in place.
--	--

### **Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test**

7.101. In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposal to develop a multimodal sustainable transport route had the potential to result in significant effects on North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Lambay Island SAC, Howth Head Coast SPA, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, North West Irish Sea cSPA, and, The Murrough SPA and that Appropriate Assessment was required in view of the conservation objectives of those sites.

7.102. Following a detailed examination and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted with the application as relevant to the Appropriate Assessment process and taking into account submissions of third parties, I am satisfied that based on the design of the proposed development, combined with the proposed mitigation measures, adverse effects on the integrity of North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Lambay Island SAC, Howth Head Coast SPA, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Dalkey Islands SPA, Malahide Estuary SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, Rockabill SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, North West Irish Sea cSPA, and The Murrough SPA, can be excluded with confidence in view of the conservation objectives of those sites.

### **My conclusion is based on the following:**

- A detailed assessment of all aspects of the proposed development that could result in significant effects or adverse effects on European Sites within a zone of influence of the development site.

- Consideration of the conservation objectives and conservation status of qualifying interest species and habitats
- A full assessment of risks to special conservation interest bird species and qualifying interest habitats and species
- Application of mitigation measures designed to avoid adverse effects on site integrity and likely effectiveness of same.

7.103. The proposed development would not undermine the favourable conservation condition of any qualifying interest feature or delay the attainment of favourable conservation condition for any species or habitat qualifying interest for these European sites.

## **8.0 Environmental Impact Assessment**

### **Introduction**

- 8.1. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) which was prepared by an environmental team led by Jacobs on behalf of the applicant. This EIA section of the report should, where appropriate, be read in conjunction with the relevant parts of the Planning Assessment above.
- 8.2. The application falls within the scope of the amending 2014 EIA Directive (Directive 2014/52/EU) on the basis that the application was lodged after the last date for transposition in May 2017. The application also falls within the scope of the European Union (Planning and Development) (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2018, as the application was lodged after these regulations come into effect on 1st September 2018.
- 8.3. The impact of the proposed development is addressed under all relevant headings with respect to the environmental factors listed in Article 3(1) of the 2014 EIA Directive. The EIAR sets out a case regarding the need for the development (Section 2.0). The EIAR provides detail with regard to the consideration of alternatives in Section 3. An overview of the main interactions is provided at Section 21. Details of the consultation

entered into by the applicant with Dublin County Council, South Dublin County Council and other prescribed bodies as part of the preparation of the project are also set out in Section 1.7 of the EIAR and the Public Consultation Report 2018-2020 which is a separate document.

- 8.4. Article 3 (2) of the Directive requires the consideration of the effects deriving from the vulnerability of the project to risks of major accidents and / or disasters that are relevant to the project concerned. The potential for 'unplanned events' is addressed in Section 20.
- 8.5. The potential for 'flooding' is considered in Section 13 Water. I consider that the requirement to consider these factors under Article 3(2) is met.
- 8.6. In terms of the content and scope of the EIAR, the information contained in the EIAR generally complies with Article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, all studies informing the EIAR are up to date and recently acquired. Additional pre-construction surveys will be required in order to provide up to date information in relation to invasive species, mammals, bats and birds, however, such issues can be adequately dealt with by condition.
- 8.7. It is important to note at the outset that the proposed development under consideration within this application does not cross international boundaries.

### **Alternatives**

- 8.8. The consideration of Alternatives is documented within Section 3 of the EIAR submitted. I note that alternatives were considered at three levels, Strategic alternatives, route alternatives and design alternatives.
- 8.9. It is stated that the appropriate type of public transport provision in any particular case is predominately determined by the likely quantum of passenger demand along the particular public transport route. With this in mind the applicant considered the option of constructing a light rail service which would cater for a passenger demand of between 3,500 and 7,000 per hour per direction (inbound and outbound journeys). Based on the number of passengers predicted to use the new service, it was considered that there would be insufficient demand to justify a light rail option. The

light rail option would also require significantly more land take, necessitating the demolition of properties.

- 8.10. Metro alternative was also considered and as there is a higher capacity requirement for such solutions it was not suitable for this route. In addition, the development of an underground metro would not remove the need for additional infrastructure to serve the residual bus needs of the area covered by the Proposed Scheme.
- 8.11. Heavy rail alternatives carry in excess of 10,000 people each direction each hour and was considered an unsuitable solution.
- 8.12. Demand management in the form of restricting car movement or car access through regulatory signage and access prohibitions, to parking restrictions and fiscal measures (such as tolls, road pricing, congestion charging, fuel/vehicle surcharges and similar) were all considered as alternatives to the proposed scheme. However, it is stated that in the case of Dublin, the existing public transport system does not currently have sufficient capacity to cater for large volumes of additional users, such measures would not work in isolation to address car journeys into and out of the city and would not encourage people onto alternative modes.
- 8.13. Whilst technological alternatives are becoming increasingly advanced, the use of electric vehicles does not address congestion problems and the need for mass transit.

#### Route Alternatives

- 8.14. The applicant outlines within section 3.3 of the EIAR that alternative route options have been considered throughout the design development in response to consultations held with the public. The route selection process is outlined in Section 3.3.1 of the EIAR. I note that a 'spider's web' of route options were considered, and a sifting process ensued. See section 4.9 of this report above for NTA response to route alternatives considered. Arising from consideration of the various permutations possible in respect of the 'spider's web', three coherent end-to-end options were identified for further assessment for Kimmage to City Centre Busconnects scheme.
- 8.15. Route options were then considered against environmental considerations such as soils and geology, flora and fauna, potential archaeological, architectural and cultural

heritage impacts and impacts to roadside amenity such as existing trees. Other constraints relating to these routes such as land availability and the extent of third-party lands to be acquired were also considered and the route selections reduced and modified accordingly.

- 8.16. Having regard to the information submitted, it is clear, the applicant has considered a significant number of options for the proposed scheme and has been responsive to consultations held and concerns raised by the public. Each emerging route was considered in relation to several criteria such as economy, safety, integration, accessibility and social inclusion and environment.
- 8.17. Whilst I note that a number of submissions are concerned with the lack of alternatives considered by the applicant, this statement is not substantiated and in the context of the information provided by the applicant I am satisfied that the applicant has carried out an extensive, detailed and robust assessment of all reasonable options for the proposed scheme. I draw the Board's attention to Chapter 3 of the EIAR in which the applicant comprehensively details all alternatives considered and the detailed assessment and consideration of the final Draft Preferred Route Options (PRO) for Section 1 – Section 3 of the route and the emergence of the preferred route.
- Section 1 Section 1 - Lower Kimmage Road from its junction with Terenure Road West to its junction with Harold's Cross Road.
  - Section 2 - Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal and
  - Section 3 - Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street junction.

### **Population and Human Health**

- 8.18. Chapters 10 and 11 of the EIAR consider the impacts to population and human health as a result of the proposed development. I note from the EIAR that impacts to population were considered under two sub assessments, i.e Community Assessment and Economic Assessment. The study area was informed by the CSO parish boundaries and are listed within section 10.2.1.1. of the EIAR. Economic study area



is defined as individual businesses within the identified community areas that could be potentially impacted by the development as a result of displaced traffic.

- 8.19. Human health is considered in the context of the overall health status of the population within the study area, social inequalities, as this can be a determinant of health, and the overall exposure of the population in the study area to environmental impacts, such as the level of exposure to certain pollutants.
- 8.20. It is important to note at this juncture that impacts to communities arising from traffic, air quality, noise and vibration and visual and landscape are considered within the relevant sections of the EIAR submitted and with the planning assessment above and in the interest of conciseness will not be repeated hereunder. This Section of my report should therefore be read in conjunction with the relevant sections mentioned.
- 8.21. Issues raised in this context within the submissions received, relate to accessibility to properties both residential and commercial. Private residents are concerned about the functionality of their properties in terms of access, noise and loss of privacy. Concerns are also raised in relation to air quality and the impact to travel times as a result of diversions due to four bus gates and turn bans, rerouted traffic and during construction. Additional concerns relate to loss of trees and impact upon Harolds Cross Park and Stoneboat built heritage, impact upon mobility impaired and elderly, footpaths too narrow, bus stops relocated inappropriately, non-continuous segregated cycle track and narrow width of cycle track. Concern of cycle route from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Estate. Concerns raised with respect to the proposed construction compound K3 on the green area to the front of Grenville Place.

#### Baseline conditions

- 8.22. In terms of relevant baseline data, the proposed scheme is located along an existing heavily trafficked route which is bounded by residential and commercial development. Of particular note in relation to baseline conditions along the route is current exceedances of both daytime and nighttime noise levels in excess of that recommended by the WHO. The applicant considers that the proposed scheme will improve the current situation in this regard, as it will enhance the potential for cycling

and pedestrian facilities by provision of safe infrastructure, segregated from general traffic wherever practicable. The proposal seeks to reduce the number of private vehicles travelling along the route and therefore further reduce noise emissions for residents. Also, the proposed route will be operated by electric buses thus significantly reducing noise generation from these large vehicles.

#### Potential Impacts

- 8.23. Overall construction impacts relating to construction noise, dust, traffic disruption will be temporary and short term in terms of the magnitude of affect and are largely mitigated without any residual effects. Table 8 below provides a summary of the effects I have noted from these chapters in relation to population and health, it outlines the magnitude of these effects and mitigation measures where proposed. I will reiterate for the benefit of the Board that such impacts are examined in detail within the relevant sections hereunder. However, it is important to note that no significant offsite health risks are expected as a result of the construction or operation of the development. Temporary disturbances given the nature of the works will not extend in the long-term post construction. I am satisfied that such impacts will not result in significant effects and can adequately be dealt with by way of mitigation.
- 8.24. Thus, having regard to the information provided within the EIAR and the submissions received, I consider the disruption to traffic as a result of both the construction of the development and the operation of the development to be the greatest impact to population and human health.

#### Mitigation Measures

- 8.25. I note that the applicant proposes to implement traffic management plans and protective measures to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists are provided with safe routes during the construction phase, and I further note that measures are proposed to facilitate deliveries to commercial premises both during construction and once the development is operational. Whilst such measures are not a perfect solution for all concerned, on balance I am satisfied that the applicant has adequately addressed the

issue of traffic disruption by way of accommodation works during the operational phase of the development and mitigation during construction and regard being had that the inconvenience created by these diversions will cause annoyance to road users at certain times, it is for a limited period of time and the effect to population and human health is not a significant long term effect.

- 8.26. I acknowledge that permeant diversion of traffic to other routes will have a negative, moderate and long-term effect due to increases in traffic on some of the surrounding road network, it is anticipated that the improved access to a new multimodal route will reduce overall car dependence and therefore reduce the number of cars accessing the surrounding road network.
- 8.27. I note that cumulative effects in relation to surrounding permitted and planned development have also been considered within the EIAR and I agree with the conclusions of the EIAR that no significant impacts are expected to arise in this regard.

### Conclusion

- 8.28. I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to population and human health and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts on population and human health can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on population and human health can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

Table 8 Population and Human Health – Summary of potential & residual effects

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
Traffic disruption	Negative, Significant and Short-Term on the basis that very sensitive	Implementation of a traffic management plan.	None

	<p>individuals will be affected.</p> <p>Negative and Slight and Short-term for general community. Access to healthcare is likely to be maintained albeit with some minor inconveniences of access</p>	(See S. 6.5 & Ap. A5.1 CEMP)	
<b>Traffic collisions</b>	Negative, Slight and Short-term on the basis that there is limited cycling provision in the baseline that would be affected and that measures will be implemented to protect diverted cyclists and pedestrians.	As Above & Implementation of measures to protect cyclists and pedestrians.	<b>None</b>
<b>Permanent traffic diversion – impact to individuals and businesses</b>	Negative, Slight and Short-term on the basis that there is limited cycling provision in the baseline that would be affected and that measures will be implemented to protect diverted cyclists and pedestrians	As Above & Improved pedestrian & multi modal routes may encourage less car use.	Positive, Slight in the Long-term
<b>Dust generation</b>	Negative, Slight and Temporary	Implementation of dust management measures.	<b>None</b>

<b>Construction Noise – sleep disturbance</b>	Negative, Slight and Temporary	See Section 9.5 & Ap. A5.1 CEMP)	<b>None</b>
<b>Operational Noise</b>	Neutral, Imperceptible and Long-term	None	<b>None</b>
<b>Other environmental hazards – water pollution, flooding, contamination. (Construction &amp; operational phases)</b>	Neutral	Measures to protect water quality and prevention of leaks and spills of hydrocarbons	<b>None</b>
<b>Health impacts</b>	Positive and Significant in the Long-Term.	People will have better access to health services	<b>None</b>
<b>Health inequalities</b>	Positive, Moderate and Long-term	People will have better access to health services	Positive, Moderate and Long-term
<b>Air impacts</b>	Positive, Slight and Long-term – reduction in vehicles and electrification of bus fleet.	None	Positive, Slight and Long-term

## Air Quality and Climate

8.29. Chapter 7 and 8 of the EIAR submitted address the potential for impacts to arise in relation to Air Quality and Climate.

### Baseline Conditions

#### Air Quality

8.30. The key pollutants considered relevant to the proposed development are identified as:

- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)
- Particulate Matter PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>
- Greenhouse gases; Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), Sulphur Hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)

8.31. The EIAR submitted outlines, within table 7.2 the upper limits for the above pollutants and within 7.2.2, 7.2.2.2 and 7.2.2.3, the relevant international and domestic legislation

and policy pertaining to same. Baseline ambient air quality is examined within section 7.3.2 of the EIAR and baseline line climate conditions are examined in section 8.4. Emissions are expected to arise in relation to both the construction and operation phases of the proposed development and will be examined in the context of the proposed mitigation measures hereunder.

- 8.32. The Proposed Scheme has been divided into three primary sections. The division line between sections has been determined by grouping similar carriageway types together. These sections have been further subdivided into 7 sub-sections, according to the types of construction works required.
- 8.33. The overall Construction Phase is forecast as 18 months (approximately), work will be transitory along the route. A CTMP has been prepared to facilitate the assessment of the potential impacts on traffic and transport. The CTMP includes details of the temporary traffic management measures that will be implemented during the construction of the Proposed Scheme. The staging of construction and associated temporary traffic management measures has considered the receiving environment when developing the schedule of works. Access will be maintained for emergency vehicles along the Proposed Scheme, throughout the Construction Phase.
- 8.34. The location of each section / sub-section along the Proposed Scheme is shown in Figure 5.1 in Volume 3 of this EIAR. The typical construction works to be carried out at each section / sub-section are described in Section 5.3.1 The Sections / Sub sections are:
- Section 1: Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road
    - Section 1a: Kimmage Cross Roads to Ravensdale Park
    - Section 1b: Lower Kimmage Road - Ravensdale Park / Sundrive Cross / Harold's Cross Park.
    - Section 1c: Kenilworth Park / Harold's Cross Road Junction
  - Section 2: Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal

- Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower, and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction
  - Section 3a: Grand Canal Bridge / Clanbrassil Street Upper
  - Section 3b: Clanbrassil Street Upper / Clanbrassil Street Lower
  - Section 3c: Clanbrassil Street Lower / New Street South

8.35. The air dispersion modelling assessment of Construction Phase traffic emissions has found that the Proposed Scheme will be neutral overall in the study area. There are no substantial or moderate adverse effects expected as a result of the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme.

8.36. In order to place the emissions due to the total Construction Phase in context, the CO<sub>2e</sub> emissions are equivalent to the construction of approximately 59 three-bedroom houses using traditional construction methods (Monahan 2011).

#### Potential Construction Impacts

8.37. In terms of effects, it is considered that demolition, earthworks, construction and track out activities will give rise to dust. I note that the applicant has had regard to IAQM guidance in relation to the identification of the magnitude of effects which are defined in the said guidance document.

8.38. The magnitude of dust emissions is defined in relation to each specific activity, as follows:

- Demolition - Demolition will primarily involve the demolition of one existing residential property at R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper. The dust emission magnitude for the proposed demolition activities is classified as small as the total building volume is likely to be less than 20,000m<sup>3</sup>, with low potential for dust release as the demolition will take place from the roof downwards in small sections.
- Earthworks – The dust emission magnitude for the proposed earthworks activities is classified as large, as the proposed Construction Compounds plus the construction site areas will have a total site area greater than 10,000m<sup>2</sup> and

there may be between 5 and 10 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time. Notwithstanding that the impact is large, the magnitude of effects from this activity to human health and ecological receptors is temporary and medium, with mitigation.

- Construction works – The dust emission magnitude for the proposed construction activities is classified as small, as the total building volume will be less than 25,000m<sup>3</sup> (retaining wall for Robert Emmet Bridge) while the key construction activities after earthworks will be the installation of the paving materials and pre-cast units for the footbridges, which have low potential for dust release. The magnitude of effects to ecological receptors and human health arising from construction works is low.
- Trackout movements – The dust emission magnitude for the proposed trackout can be classified as medium with between approximately 10 and 50 HDV (heavy duty vehicles) outward movements in any one day during peak construction activity and with surface material with a low potential for dust release. The magnitude of effects to human health is considered to be medium, temporary and low in relation to ecological receptors.

8.39. Construction traffic – 3 public roads are identified as required construction access routes where construction traffic will be permitted to travel along. An additional 88 HDV vehicles per day associated with construction traffic along each road including construction deliveries and earthworks material haulage are added to the base traffic volumes. I note the estimated construction traffic volumes are based on the peak construction period volumes and are therefore a worst-case assumption. The applicant considers that the scheme will be constructed in phases with lower volumes and the corridor of the proposed scheme will be used for a large bulk of construction delivery vehicles along its route.

8.40. The potential air quality impacts associated with additional construction traffic is examined in relation to NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Modelled receptors are outlined in the tables within Appendix A7.1 of the EIAR. Most impacted receptors are outlined in table 7.30 of the EIAR and refer to receptors with non-negligible impacts.



- 8.41. As shown in Table 7.30 and Figure 7.3 in Volume 3 of the EIAR the majority of modelled receptors are estimated to experience a negligible impact due to the Proposed Scheme in terms of the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration. A slightly beneficial impact is estimated at 50 receptors and a moderate beneficial impact at one receptor due to the diversion of traffic off the Proposed Scheme routes. As shown in Table 7.30 and Figure 7.4 in Volume 3 of this EIAR, the Proposed Scheme will be overall neutral in terms of annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations, with all receptors experiencing a negligible impact. As shown in Table 7.30 and Figure 7.5 in Volume 3 of this EIAR, the Proposed Scheme will be overall neutral in terms of the annual mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration with all receptors experiencing a negligible impact.
- 8.42. Overall, it is stated within the EIAR that construction vehicles, generators etc. may give rise to some NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> / PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. Table 7.35 summarises the Construction Phase impacts prior and post-mitigation. In terms of construction traffic impacts, the Proposed Scheme will have a neutral impact on air quality. The works will be short-term and temporary in nature, and the impact on air quality will not be significant. Therefore, no specific Construction Phase mitigation measures for construction traffic are required.

#### Mitigation

- 8.43. Mitigation measures proposed during the construction phase of the development relate to the suppression of dust during the construction phase. Such measures include road sweeping, water misting or spraying during dusty activities, use of tarpaulins when transporting materials and use of site hoardings of 2.4 metres high. Significant residual impacts are not expected to arise.

#### Potential Operational impacts

- 8.44. The air dispersion modelling assessment has found that the majority of all modelled receptors are predicted to experience negligible impacts due to the Proposed Scheme, and beneficial impacts are also estimated along the length of the Proposed Scheme. There are no substantial or moderate adverse effects expected as a result of the Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme. In 2028, all receptors will have ambient

air quality in compliance with the ambient air quality limit values for the DS scenario. In 2043, all receptors are expected to have ambient air quality in compliance with the ambient air quality standards for the DM and the DS scenarios. Overall, it is considered that the residual effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme's operation will be Neutral and Long-Term.

- 8.45. I am satisfied that the deposition levels will be below the permitted critical load and that in all cases no significant impacts will arise.

Mitigation for Operational phase

- 8.46. As the Proposed Scheme will have a generally neutral impact on air quality, no specific Operational Phase mitigation or monitoring measures are recommended. Whilst not a mitigation measure as such, it is noted that in time, vehicle emissions technology will improve and the Irish vehicle fleet will continue to evolve to the extent that vehicle emissions impacts associated with the Proposed Scheme are anticipated to be short-term. City wide traffic management measures and proactive encouragement of low emissions vehicle uptake would accelerate these improvements.
- 8.47. No mitigation is proposed in relation to the operational phase of the proposed scheme and no residual impacts are expected.
- 8.48. I have considered the potential for cumulative impacts to arise in relation to air quality and having regard to the information submitted and given the lack of any significant impacts associated with either the construction phase of the development or the operational phase of the proposal, I am satisfied that proposed development would not give rise to significant cumulative impacts in relation to air quality.
- 8.49. I acknowledge that a number of submissions raised concerns regarding increases in air pollution as a result of the development. Particular concerns were raised in relation to the removal of trees / green areas and the movement of road space closer to properties. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns of third parties, the information provided in this regard is clear, robust and detailed and I am satisfied that based on the information provided notwithstanding the concerns raised within submissions significant impacts will not occur in relation to air pollution.

## Climate

- 8.50. It is important to note at the outset when considering the proposed development in the context of climate, that Bus Connects is identified within the Climate Action Plan 2024 (CAP 24) as a key project that will contribute to the reduction in GHG within Ireland's cities. The CAP 24 supports the reallocation of road space to public transport and active travel and seeks to advance the bus connects programme in all 5 cities, over the coming years.
- 8.51. Impacts to climate are considered within section 8 of the EIAR and are considered in the context of GHG emissions relating to land use change and construction, traffic related emissions and operational related emissions. Recent weather patterns and extreme weather events reported by Met Eireann, have been considered in the context of climate change locally.

## Potential Construction Impacts

- 8.52. It is important to note at the outset that the key phases of the GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions generation are the embodied carbon of the construction materials and the construction activities, which, when combined, account for over 96% of all carbon emissions.
- 8.53. The applicant states that the Proposed Scheme is estimated to result in total Construction Phase GHG emissions of 2,962 tonnes embodied CO<sub>2eq</sub> for materials over an 18-month period, equivalent to an annualised total of 0.005% of Ireland's non-ETS 2020 target and 0.033% of the 2030 Transport Emission Ceiling. The potential impact to climate due to embodied carbon emissions during the Construction Phase, prior to mitigation, are deemed to be a minor adverse impact.
- 8.54. In terms of identifying the magnitude of effect arising from the construction phase of the development, I note that in the absence of the agreed CAP24 Sectoral Emission Ceilings any increase in GHG had to be considered significant. As such the applicant has stated impacts arising from the construction phase of the development are negative, minor adverse and short term.

8.55. Thus, whilst I acknowledge the justification in relation to the stated magnitude of effects to climate arising from the construction phase of the development, I am satisfied that having examined the carbon emission equivalent of the proposal in the context of the Sectoral Emission Ceilings set out in CAP24, that the proposed development would not give rise to any significant climate impacts and has been adequately assessed within the EIAR in this regard.

#### Potential Operational Impacts

8.56. With regard to the operational phase of the development it is important to note that climate is heavily influenced by GHG emissions and transport emissions are a significant factor in the level of GHGs released into the atmosphere. I draw the Boards attention to section 8.4.3 of the EIAR in which it is stated that private cars accounted for 73.7% of all road trips in 2019 whilst public transport accounted for 6.5% which I note is an increase of 3% from the previous year. It is stated within the EIAR submitted that transport is the second highest emitter of GHG nationally and currently accounts for 20.3% of the national GHG output, with cars accounting for 57.4% of total road transport GHG emissions. I draw the Boards attention to CAP 24 in which updated figures are provided in this regard, latest figures state that transport is responsible for 17.1% of the national GHG output. Transport emissions over both 2021 and 2022 have seen increases in emissions of approx. 6% per annum with the ending of pandemic restrictions and the return to pre-Covid levels of economic activity.

Whilst transport emissions associated with the construction phase will increase slightly, it is important to consider the overall impact of the development during both the construction and operational phase. The proposed development is expected to be in use for 60 years and will support the delivery of an efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service, which supports the achievement of Ireland's emission reduction targets. It is stated that the Proposed Scheme has the potential to reduce CO<sub>2e</sub> emissions equivalent to the removal of approximately 16,580 and 20,849 car trips per weekday from the road network in 2028 and 2043 respectively. This represents a significant contribution towards the increased use of lower-carbon modes and reduction in the percentage of total journeys that are made by private car

(modal share) from over 70% (today) to just over 50% in 2030 as set out in table 15.5 of CAP24.

- 8.57. In relation to impacts to sequestered carbon I note a number of trees (some 17) will be removed as part of the earth works and preparation stage of construction and third parties have expressed their concerns in this regard. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns raised I note the trees lost are generally small specimens and will mostly be replaced by new trees to be planted in the same general area, which taken in the context of the proposed construction works will have a neutral effect on the sequestering of carbon over the life of the development. I also note that some grassland will temporarily be removed to facilitate Construction Compounds. This will be temporary in nature and negligible and not be a significant impact. In summary of the foregoing, the applicant has stated that the magnitude of effects arising from the operation of the development will be Negligible and Permanent. I note no mitigation is required in relation to the operation or maintenance of the proposed development and no residual impacts arise.
- 8.58. Having regard to the information submitted and the requirements outlined within CAP 24, I am satisfied that all impacts in relation to climate have been robustly assessed and the applicant has considered all aspects of the development in a detailed manner within both sections 7 and 8 of the EIAR and has provided extensive information in support of the analysis submitted within the relevant appendices to this document. I am also satisfied that the proposal is supported by the recently adopted CAP 24 which was not finalised prior to the submission of this application but is nonetheless essential to the assessment of the development in the foregoing context.
- 8.59. It is important to state that in considering the impact on climate I have had regard to the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021 which requires Ireland to achieve a 51% reduction in emissions by 2030 (relative to 2018 levels) and a 20% reduction by 2025.

## Conclusion

8.60. In conclusion, I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to air quality and climate and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on air quality and climate can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on air quality and climate can be ruled out I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise, given that overall risks subject to mitigation being implemented are predicted as being negligible and permanent.

*Table 9 Air Quality & Climate – Summary of potential & residual effects*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
Dust Generation during construction.	Negative, not significant and short term.	Cleaning of roads, watering of stockpiles, covering trucks, site hoarding 2.4 in height.	Not significant
Overall construction phase traffic impacts to air quality in vicinity of scheme.  (Impacts to human health)	Neutral and short term	None	Not significant
Construction traffic impacts to air quality	Neutral and short term	None	Not significant

within areas taking diverted traffic.			
Embodied Carbon	Negative, Minor and Short-Term	Reduce use of materials such as concrete and fuels and reuse materials where practicable	Negative, Minor and Short-Term
Impacts arising from operation and maintenance	Negligible and Permanent	None	Negligible and Permanent

## **Noise and Vibration**

8.62. Chapter 9 of the EIAR examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to noise and vibration. I highlight that a number of third party submission have raised concerns in relation to noise and the potential for operational noise to impact residential amenity. I will therefore examine the potential for such impacts to arise hereunder within this section of the EIAR.

### **Baseline Conditions**

8.63. In order to establish baseline conditions, the applicant utilised Traffic Noise level monitoring data which is recorded and mapped by the EPA. The applicant also carried out independent noise surveys in the form of attended and unattended surveys at various locations along the route. Attended surveys were undertaken at a total of 9 locations along the length of the Proposed Scheme during July 2020. Due to the absence of secure locations to install equipment for unattended periods (i.e., front of properties which bound the road with no secure boundary fencing) all surveys were attended. I refer the Board to Section 1.3 of appendix A9.1 of the EIAR which outlines specific survey dates and times for each location and results. Tables 9.19 – 9.21 of the EIAR outline the overall survey results in relation to each location.

- 8.64. Baseline data results identify road traffic as the dominant noise experienced along the route during both daytime and night-time hours. At the closest properties impacted by the works (typically between 10m to 30m), the prevailing daytime baseline noise level is assumed as 67 dB LAeq,12 hr and the evening baseline noise level as 65 dB LAeq,4hr. As discussed in Section 9.3.2.4, baseline noise levels measured as part of the baseline study are potentially 1 dB to 2 dB lower than those under normal conditions without restricted movements due to COVID-19. To allow for a conservative assessment, however no correction has been made to these values when discussing the CNLs against the baseline noise environment.
- 8.65. The noise survey results for Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road are dominated by road traffic noise from R817 Kimmage Road Lower and Harold's Cross Road, in addition to traffic along the surrounding road network with a small contribution from local urban sources (e.g. pedestrian movements, car horns, dogs barking etc.). Average daytime noise levels ranged between 49 dB to 71 dB LAeq,T. Lowest measured noise levels are those within Mount Argus Grove, a residential area set back from any significant passing through traffic. Highest measured noise levels are those measured along the footpath of the R187. Lden values calculated in this area ranged between 52 dB to 73 dB Lden.
- 8.66. The noise survey results from Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal are dominated by road traffic noise from the R137 Harold's Cross Road, the R817 Kimmage Road Lower, in addition to traffic along the surrounding road network with a small contribution from local urban sources (e.g. pedestrian movements, car horns etc.). During daytime periods, average ambient noise levels ranged between 62 dB to 69 dB LAeq,T. The higher value of being recorded due to the closer proximity to the road edge. The measured Lden values calculated in this area ranged between 66 dB to 71 dB Lden.
- 8.67. The noise survey results within the Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction are dominated by road traffic from R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper / Lower, in addition to traffic along the surrounding road network with a small contribution from local urban sources (e.g.



pedestrian movements, commercial / retail activities and source etc.). Average daytime noise levels ranged between 62 dB to 66 dB LAeq,T. The higher value of being recorded due to the closer proximity to the road edge. Lden values calculated in this area ranged between 65 dB to 69 dB Lden.

- 8.68. I note that noise surveys were carried during COVID restrictions. The applicant has addressed the potential impact to baseline data gathered at this time and has reviewed long term noise monitoring locations based on long term noise monitoring data provided by DCC. Review of the DCC noise monitoring data has indicated that the overall difference in average noise levels between June and October of 2019 and 2020 are between 1dB to 2dB lower. It is stated that noise levels are likely to be 0.4dB to 1.5dB lower during the 2020 survey periods when compared to the same months during 2019 due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. This difference in levels is negligible in the overall context of describing the prevailing baseline noise environment.
- 8.69. Vibration surveys were also conducted at a control location and various urban locations and results indicate that vibration levels associated with a heavily trafficked urban – suburban road with a mix of fleet inclusive of dedicated bus lane result in negligible vibration levels at the edge of the road both in terms of human perception and building response.

#### Potential impacts of noise and vibration

- 8.70. Noise generation will arise in relation to construction works and the operation of plant during this time and will also relate to the increase in buses utilising the route during operation. There is also a potential for noise disturbance to arise in areas which cater for diverted traffic both during construction and permanently during the operation of the development.
- 8.71. The applicant has examined all sources of noise associated with the construction and operation of the development. The EIAR examines each construction activity at specific locations and considers the impact in terms of a range of distances at noise sensitive locations, I draw the boards attention to tables 9.26 – 9.40 in which each construction activity is outlined in terms of noise emissions relative to the distance from

NSLs. In the absence of mitigation, it is clear from the tables indicate that noise exceedances will occur in relation to all activities at the closest distances to NSLs and at some other distances to varying degrees of intensity. The magnitude of impacts therefore ranges from slight to very significant, on a temporary basis and over the short term during both daytime and nighttime hours.

- 8.72. The predicted noise levels are between 69 to 78 dB  $L_{Aeq,T}$  at closest NSLs to Construction Compounds associated with day to day material handing activities. With reference to the CNLs (Construction Noise Level) in Table 9.32, it is stated that the potential noise impacts at the closest NSLs from Construction Compound K2, to be located in the grounds of Our Lady's Hospice to west of R137 Harold's Cross Road, range between Negative, Moderate to Very Significant, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Significant to Very Significant and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.73. For Construction Compound K1, the indicative predicted cumulative noise level associated with day to day material handing activities will be in the order of 72 dB  $L_{Aeq,T}$ . Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.32, the predicted noise impacts at the closest NSLs will range between Negative, Slight to Moderate, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Significant to Very Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods, in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.74. While at Construction Compound K3, the indicative predicted cumulative noise level with day to day material handing activities will be in the order of 69 dB  $L_{Aeq,T}$ . Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.32, the predicted noise impacts at the closest NSLs will range between Negative, Slight to Moderate, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Moderate to Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.75. Construction traffic has been modelled and it is expected that 360 HGV movements (180 vehicles) will occur over a peak construction day. Modelling has been carried out at numerous locations outlined in Table 9.26 of the EIAR. General road works including junction realignments, along Lower Kimmage Road between Kimmage Cross Roads and the junction with Harold's Cross Road as well as the along

Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South between the Grand Canal and the Patrick Street junction, will be between 10m to 15m of the nearest NSLs. The predicted noise levels for these works at the closest NSLs are between 76 to 79 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.26, the potential noise impacts at the closest NSLs range between Negative, Moderate to Significant, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Significant to Very Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods in the absence of noise mitigation.

- 8.76. As summarised in Table 9.28, in the three geographical sections of the Proposed Scheme, road widening, and utility diversion works will be within 10m to 20m of the nearest NSLs. The indicative predicted noise levels for these works at the closest NSL facades are between 77 to 83 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.28, the potential noise impacts at the closest NSLs range between Negative, Moderate to Very Significant, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Significant to Very Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.77. It is notable that Table 9.28 of the EIAR includes the proposed new car park on Harold's Cross Road, in the grounds of Our Lady's Hospice. The proposed works will include the provision of 22 car parking spaces, along with new boundary treatment and landscaping works. It is expected that the plant noise levels used for car park construction work will be no greater than for the road widening works outlined in Table 9.27. The car park works will be within 10m of the nearest NSLs. The indicative predicted cumulative noise level for these works will be in the order of 83 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.28, the predicted noise impact at the closest NSLs will be Negative, Significant to Very Significant, and Temporary during the daytime, evening and weekend periods, in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.78. As summarised in Table 9.36, in the Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road geographical section, a parallel cycleway will be developed to the west, requiring a new boardwalk structure over the

River Poddle. These works will require the use of bored piles along the length of the new structure. The nearest NSLs will be within 15m of the proposed bored piling works. The indicative predicted cumulative noise level for these works at the closest NSL facades will be in the order of 77 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.36, the predicted noise impacts at the closest NSLs will range between Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary during the daytime period and in the absence of noise mitigation.

- 8.79. I note that the EIAR sets out that in the Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction geographical section, the provision of the footbridges to the west of Robert Emmet Bridge are proposed. The structure will be independently supported by two piers atop bored piles at the northern and southern end of the footbridge. The nearest NSLs will be within 20m to 30m of the proposed bored piling works. The indicative predicted cumulative noise level for these works at the closest NSL facades will be between 70 to 74 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.36, the predicted noise impacts at the closest NSLs will range between Negative, Slight to Moderate, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Moderate to Very Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.80. In the same geographical section, a pedestrian bridge to the east of Robert Emmet Bridge is proposed. These works will require installation of bored piles into the bank of the Grand Canal and bank seats at each end of the bridge. The nearest NSLs will be within 10m to 20m of the proposed bored piling works. The indicative predicted cumulative noise level for these works at the closest NSL facades will be between 74 to 80 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.36, the predicted noise impacts at the closest NSLs will range between Negative, Slight to Significant, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Significant to Very Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods in the absence of noise mitigation.

- 8.81. The provision of a retaining wall on the western side of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper is proposed. These works will require bored piles along the length of the structure. The nearest NSLs will be within 20m of the proposed bored piling works. The indicative predicted cumulative noise level for these works at the closest NSL facades will be in the order of 74 dB LAeq,T in the absence of any noise mitigation. Making reference to the CNLs in Table 9.36, the predicted noise impacts at the closest NSLs will range between Negative, Slight to Moderate, and Temporary during the daytime period and Negative, Significant to Very Significant, and Temporary during the evening and weekend periods, in the absence of noise mitigation.
- 8.82. I highlight that minor works associated with quiet street treatment will also occur within Section 2 involving raising of footpaths or paved areas in confined areas at junctions. This activity will occur within 10 to 15m of the closest NSLs for brief to temporary periods with indicative calculated levels of the order of 80 to 83 dB LAeq which is a potentially significant effect depending on the duration over which it occurs.
- 8.83. I note impacts arise as a result of traffic management measures and related redistributed traffic temporarily onto surrounding roads. The change in traffic noise is defined as major with traffic noise level calculated at the closest NSLs along these roads categorised as moderate. The overall impact is determined to be negative, moderate and temporary. I draw the boards attention to Table 11 below in which impacts in relation to all other roads considered within 1km radius of the development are outlined and range between negative medium/moderate to positive, imperceptible, and temporary.
- 8.84. Potential impacts arising from vibration are associated with the widening and upgrading of existing footpaths and kerbs. Such activities require earthmoving, excavation and compaction which are identified within the TII guidance for the treatment of Noise and Vibration in national road schemes as having potential to generate significant amounts of vibration.
- 8.85. I note from the information submitted that the magnitude of effects associated with this activity is stated as negative, slight to moderate, temporary effects at distances of 10m from the activity. Beyond 50m from this type of activity, impacts are stated to be

reduced to not significant to slight and temporary. For all other works, vibration impacts will be below those associated with perceptible vibration and will be imperceptible to not significant and temporary.

- 8.86. I further note that the applicant states that all construction works are orders of magnitude below limits values associated with any form of cosmetic or structural damage for structurally sound or protected or historical buildings or structures. Based on the information submitted I am satisfied that a robust and detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out by the applicant and that no significant effects arise from the proposed works.

#### Mitigation Measures

- 8.87. Mitigation measures are set out within the Construction Management Plan and are discussed in Section 9.5 of the EIAR. As outlined above and within the summary table below it is clear that the largest magnitude of effects arises at distances of 10 - 30 metres from the proposed works and relate to construction related activities whereby concrete is to be removed and replaced, boundary walls are being replaced and road widening is to be carried out. Other significant impacts arise during evening and weekend hours whereby the upper limit for ambient noise is lower.
- 8.88. Thus, whilst mitigation is proposed in relation to all construction related works, of particular note are the measures relating to general road works, road widening and diversion, works relating to quiet streets, site compounds and boundary treatment. I note in this regard that machinery will be fitted with acoustic exhausts and within enclosure panels which will reduce noise by 10dB. Mufflers will be fitted to pneumatic concrete breakers and tools, noisy items will be placed away from NSLs and sensitive boundaries. Compressors will be sounded by acoustic lagging or enclosed within the acoustic enclosure. Screens will be used to dampen noise near NSLs when breakers or drill bits are used. Site hoarding of 2.4m in height will be provided along noise sensitive boundaries and at the Construction Compounds. Such measures can also reduce noise levels by up to 10dB.

- 8.89. Works will be carried out largely within daytime hours, however, it will be necessary to carry out some works infrequently during nighttime hours. The applicant states that cumulative noise impacts will be carefully considered and avoided in order to protect NSLs. It is intended that construction activities will be scheduled in a manner that reflects the location of the site and the nature of neighbouring properties.
- 8.90. The type of works and the duration will be communicated to residents at all times so that residents are aware of the type of work to be carried out and can plan accordingly. Noise monitoring will ensure that any exceedances are addressed without delay. Similarly works which may give rise to vibration will only be carried out during daytime hours and monitoring will ensure exceedance of upper limits do not arise.
- 8.91. Overall mitigation measures are expected to reduce noise levels by 10dB. The prevailing daytime baseline noise levels is assumed as 65dB and evening baseline levels are 63dB. Following mitigation, the highest predicted construction noise levels are between 67 to 75 dB LAeq,T at the closest properties impacted by the most intrusive works. The higher impacts will be at those properties where the prevailing baseline is below the specific predicted construction works noise levels. No significant effects are expected during daytime hours post mitigation. Significant residual effects only remain in relation to nighttime and weekend hours whereby upper limit thresholds are lower at these times.
- 8.92. Overall, it is expected that in most instances noise generated by works will assimilate into the existing background noise levels and will not give rise to significant impacts. In addition, as the proposed development is a linear route, works will move continuously therefore being temporary in nature at any location along the route.

#### Residual Impacts

- 8.93. Significant residual impacts remain during night-time and evening hours in relation to the majority of scheduled works within 20m of the works and in relation to road widening/ utility diversion works and boundary walls reconstruction within 10m of the works.

- 8.94. In this regard I note that the applicant has had regard to the DMRB Noise and Vibration (UKHA 2020) in cases of moderate to major magnitude of impacts, the duration of works determines the overall significance rating. As part of the mitigation measures, the durations advised in the DMRB Noise and Vibration (UKHA 2020) will be followed, where feasible, to reduce overall significance effects (i.e. scheduling works to occur for periods of less than ten days/nights over 15 consecutive day/night periods and less than 40 days over six consecutive months where significant effects are identified). Once the CNL and duration of works is considered in line with the DMRB Noise and Vibration (UKHA 2020) all key Construction Phase residual noise levels are not considered to be significant.
- 8.95. As outlined above significant impacts do not arise in relation to vibrations and as such significant residual impacts will not occur. In addition, the magnitude of effects arising from the operation of the development is positive to neutral direct impact, mitigation measures are therefore not proposed in relation to the operational phase of the development.

#### Conclusion

- 8.96. I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to noise and vibration and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on noise and vibration can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts in relation to Noise and Vibration can be ruled out I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.



*Table 10 Noise & Vibration – Summary of potential & residual effects*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
General Road Works, Quiet Street Treatment and Urban Realm Landscaping	<p><u>Daytime</u> - Negative, Moderate to Significant, and Temporary</p> <p><u>Evening time and Weekends</u> - Negative, Significant to Very Significant and Temporary</p>	Yes, Localised screening around high noise level plant items.	<p><u>Daytime</u> Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs within 10m from the proposed works; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 10m from the proposed works.</p> <p><u>Evening time and Weekend</u></p> <p>Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary at NSLs within 15m from the proposed works; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 15m from the proposed works</p>
Road Widening, Road reconstruction, Utility Diversion Works, retaining walls	<p><u>Daytime ranges</u> relate to distance from works and range between negative, not significant to very significant, and temporary.</p> <p><u>Evening &amp; wknd</u></p> <p>Negative, not significant to very significant, and temporary during</p>	<p>Yes,</p> <p>Refer to Section 9.5.1.1 for the range of noise mitigation measures which will be adopted at specific working areas to reduce noise impacts at NSLs.</p> <p>Particular emphasis is given to localised screening around high noise level plant items</p>	<p><u>Daytime</u> - Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs within 15m from the proposed works; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 15m from the proposed works.</p> <p><u>Nighttime</u> - Negative, Significant to Very Significant and Temporary at NSLs within 10m from the proposed works; and</p> <p>Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary at NSLs within 15m to 20m from the proposed works; and Negative, Not</p>

	the evening and weekend periods	including, breakers and excavators and enclosures for power packs (vacuum excavators) and quiet plant.	Negative, not significant and temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 20m from the proposed works.
Boundary Wall, and structures	<p><u>Daytime period</u> - at nearest distance - Negative, Moderate to Significant and temporary</p> <p><u>Evening &amp; weekends</u> – at nearest distance- Negative, significant to very significant, and temporary.</p>	Yes, as above	<p><u>Daytime</u> - Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs within 15m from the proposed works; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 15m from the proposed works.</p> <p><u>Evening &amp; weekends</u>. Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary at NSLs within 15m from the proposed works; Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs within 15m to 20m from the proposed works; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 20m from the proposed works.</p>
Construction Compounds	<p><u>Daytime Period:</u> Negative, Significant to Very Significant and Temporary at NSL's within 5m of Construction Compound K2</p> <p>• Negative, Slight to Moderate and</p>	Yes, as above	<p><u>Daytime range</u> – Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs within 10m of the Construction Compound boundaries; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at all other distances.</p>

	<p>Temporary at NSL's between 15 to 30m distance from the three Construction Compounds during daytime.</p> <p><u>Nighttime and Weekends:</u></p> <p>Negative, Significant to Very Significant and Temporary at NSLs within 20m of the Construction Compounds; Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary at NSLs between 20m to 40m from the Construction Compounds</p>		<p><b><u>Evening &amp; weekends</u></b> Negative, Moderate to Significant at NSLs within 10m of the Construction Compound boundaries;</p> <p>Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary between 10m to 15m distance.</p> <p>Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at a distance greater than 15m.</p>
Retaining Wall Construction Works	<p><u>Daytime Period:</u></p> <p>Negative, moderate to significant and temporary at NSLs between 10m to 15m of the proposed works.</p> <p>Slight to moderate and temporary at NSLs within 20m to</p>	Yes, as above	<p>Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs within 15m distance from the proposed works; and</p> <p>Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 15m from the proposed works.</p>

	<p>40m of the proposed works.</p> <p>Not significant at distances greater than 40m from the proposed works. All impacts noted above are in the absence of noise mitigation</p> <p><u>Nighttime and Weekends:</u></p> <p>. Negative, Significant to Very Significant and Temporary at NSLs within 30m distance from the proposed works;</p> <p>. Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary at NSLs between 30m to 50m of the proposed works;</p> <p>. Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary at NSLs between 50m to 60m of the proposed works; and Negative, Not Significant and Temporary at distances greater</p>		<p>Negative, Moderate to Significant and Temporary at NSLs between 10m to 15m from the proposed works;</p> <p>Negative, not significant and temporary at NSLs at distances greater than 15m from the proposed works</p>
--	--	--	---

	than 60m from the proposed works		
Construction vibration from general road works and construction activities & ground breaking beyond 50m	Negative, Imperceptible to Not Significant and Temporary	Yes, As above	Negative, Imperceptible to Not Significant and Temporary
Construction vibration from ground breaking activities within 10m of occupied residential buildings	Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary.	Yes, Localised screening around high noise level plant items.	Negative, Slight and Temporary
Construction Traffic – within 1Km of study area	Positive, Slight, and Temporary impact to Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary		Positive, Slight, and Temporary impact to Negative, Slight to Moderate and Temporary
Summary of Potential Daytime Operational Phase Impacts – Opening Year (2028)			
Cashel Road	Moderate	No	Indirect, Negative, Slight to Moderate and Short to Medium-Term

Ravensdale Park	Moderate		Indirect, Negative, Slight to Moderate and Short to Medium-Term
Clonard Road	Moderate		Indirect, Negative, Not Significant to Slight and Short to Medium-Term
Kenilworth Park	Moderate		Indirect, Negative, Slight to Moderate, Short to Medium-Term
Mountpleasant Avenue Lower	Moderate		
Operational Phase			
Opening Year (2028) traffic noise – Proposed Scheme	Direct, Positive, Moderate and Short to Medium-Term to Direct, Neutral, and Short to Medium-Term	No	Direct, Positive, Moderate and Short to Medium-Term to Direct, Neutral, and Short to Medium-Term.
Opening Year (2028) traffic noise – Surrounding road network	Indirect, Positive, Moderate and Short to Medium-Term to Indirect, Negative, Slight to Moderate and Short to Medium-Term	No	Indirect, Positive, Moderate and Short to Medium-Term to Indirect, Negative, Slight to Moderate and Short to Medium-Term
Design Year (2043) traffic noise – Proposed Scheme	Direct, Positive, Moderate and Long-Term to Direct, Neutral and Long-Term	No	Direct, Positive, Moderate and Long-Term to Direct, Neutral and Long-Term.

Design Year (2043) traffic noise – Surrounding Road Network	Indirect, Positive, Moderate and Long-Term to Indirect, Negative, Not Significant to Slight and Long-Term	No	Indirect, Positive, Moderate and Long-Term to Indirect, Negative, Not Significant to Slight and Long-Term
Operational Phase Vibration	Neutral, Negligible and Short to Long-Term	No	Neutral, Negligible and Short to Long-Term
Bus stops – new locations	Negative, Not Significant, Long-Term	No	Negative, Not Significant, Long-Term.

### **Biodiversity**

- 9.34. Chapter 12 of the EIAR submitted examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to biodiversity. This element of the development will focus on biodiversity in general within the site and its surrounds.

### **Baseline Conditions**

- 9.35. The lands within and adjacent to the development site are urban in nature. The route has an overall length of approx. 3.7Km, from the R817 Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with Fortfield Road and R818 Terenure Road West (KCR), to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road, via Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal, then along Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street / R110 Kevin Street Junction, from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.
- 9.36. The majority of the Proposed Scheme route is dominated by residential and buildings and artificial surfaces habitats. There are a number of parklands (Poddle Park, Mount Argus Park and Harold's Cross Park) consisting of amenity grassland, scattered trees and parkland and treeline habitat adjacent to the roads. Habitats

present at the Kimmage Cross Roads include scattered trees and parkland, amenity grassland and freshwater river habitat at Poddle Park.

- 9.37. An offline cycle track will be provided at the Ravensdale Park / R817 Kimmage Road Lower Junction. This offline cycle track will traverse Poddle Park (a road), Bangor Road, Blarney Park, Sundrive Road, Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View, re-joining the Proposed Scheme at the Mount Argus View / R817 Kimmage Road Lower Junction. The Proposed Scheme will then traverse residential development and buildings and artificial surfaces on the eastern bus corridor, while scattered trees and parkland and freshwater habitats will also present on the proposed cycleway.
- 9.38. Limited freshwater habitats are present along the Proposed Scheme route as the cycle track will intersect with the River Poddle at several locations, including a proposed Stone Boat boardwalk over the River Poddle at Mount Argus View, and the Grand Canal at Robert Emmet Bridge in Harold's Cross. Residential properties will give way to commercial development when the Proposed Scheme crosses the Grand Canal, buildings and artificial surfaces will dominate accentuated by city landscaping features including treelines, amenity grassland and scattered trees and parkland (i.e. St. Patrick's Cathedral and Park).
- 9.39. The Zol of the Proposed Scheme in relation to terrestrial habitats is generally limited to the footprint of the Proposed Scheme, and the immediate environs. The applicant acknowledges within the EIAR that Hydrological and Air Quality impacts can cause effects to biodiversity at significant distances from the development boundaries. The potential for significant effects is therefore considered within a wider zone of influence for these two issues.
- 9.40. Air quality Zol is set depending on the activity i.e 50 m from proposed scheme, 500m from construction compound during construction phases and 200m proposed scheme boundary or local road networks experiencing a change in AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) flows greater than 1,000 during the Operational Phase.
- 9.41. The Zol for aquatic plant and animal species includes all estuarine habitats located downstream of where the Proposed Scheme will drain to the proposed crossing points



(these are outlined in Table 12.4 of the EIAR) Water Bodies Hydrologically Connected to the Proposed Scheme and Within its Zol and the marine environment of Dublin Bay.

9.42. The Zol for impacts to aquatic fauna species, such as Atlantic salmon *Salmo salmar* and lamprey species *Lampetra spp*, is limited to those water courses that will be crossed by the Proposed Scheme or water bodies to which runoff from the Proposed Scheme could drain to during construction and operation.

- The River Poddle - Will be crossed by the Proposed Scheme at a number of locations.
- The Grand Canal - Will be crossed by the Proposed Scheme at Robert Emmet Bridge.
- Liffey Estuary Upper - Approximately 700m north of the terminus of the Proposed Scheme - surface water connectivity to Proposed Scheme through the River Poddle, approximately 3.2km downstream of the Mount Argus Way Crossing.
- Liffey Estuary Lower - Immediately downstream of Liffey Estuary Upper - surface water connectivity to Proposed Scheme via the Liffey Estuary Upper and the Grand Canal, approximately 3.8km downstream of the Robert Emmet Bridge crossing.
- Dublin Bay - Surface water connectivity to Proposed Scheme. Approximately 9.8km downstream of the Robert Emmet Bridge crossing over the Grand Canal and approximately 12.2km downstream of the Mount Argus Way crossing over the River Poddle.

9.43. Zol for other species are as follows:

- Pygmy shrew – 100m from proposed scheme boundary
- Otters, badgers, stoat, and hedgehogs – extends to greater distances and breeding sites is 150m from boundary of scheme.
- Bat roost – 200m which can be adjusted accordingly depending on species. Habitat severance could extend for several kilometers.

- Breeding, wintering birds – *ex-situ* up to 300m.
- Amphibian species – direct habitat loss/ severance and indirect impacts to water quality in wetland habitats.
- Common Lizard – direct habitat loss and severance / displacement during construction.

9.44. Overall, it is clear that the determination of the zone of influence differs depending on the construction and operational activity.

9.45. It is important to note at this juncture that the proposed development does not fall within the boundary of any European sites, Ramsar Sites, designated NHAs, Nature reserves or Biosphere Reserves. The nearest European site to the Proposed Scheme is South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, which is located approximately 3.6km east of the Proposed Scheme (as the crow flies) and approximately 6.7km downstream of the proposed crossing point on the Grand Canal. This is followed by South Dublin Bay SAC, which is located approximately 3.9km east of the Proposed Scheme and approximately 7.5km downstream of the proposed crossing point on the Grand Canal. North Bull Island SPA is also located in Dublin Bay, approximately 6.5km from the Proposed Scheme.

9.46. The following European sites located in Dublin Bay are hydrologically connected and downstream of the Proposed Scheme. These European sites are North Dublin Bay SAC, South Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA, Howth Head Coast SPA, Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, Dalkey Island SPA and North-West Irish Sea c.SPA. These European sites will be hydrologically connected to the Proposed Scheme via three watercourses, i.e. the Grand Canal Main Line, River Poddle (Poddle\_010) and the Liffey Estuary Upper.

9.47. There are nine SPAs designated for SCI species that are known to forage and / or roost at inland sites across Dublin City and / or utilise Dublin Bay. These are Malahide Estuary SPA, Baldoyle Bay SPA, Rogerstown Estuary SPA, Skerries Islands SPA, North Bull Island SPA, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA, Ireland's Eye SPA, Lambay Island SPA, and The Murrough SPA.

- 9.48. There are two European sites containing marine mammals which are known to frequent Dublin Bay and the Liffey Estuary Lower. These are Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC and Lambay Island SAC.
- 9.49. There are 27 no. European sites (SACs or SPAs) located within the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme, of which 16 no. are located within the Zol. Each site, their distance to the Proposed Scheme and their designations (QIs / SCIs) are listed in Table 12.5, and illustrated in Figure 12.3 in Volume 3 of the submitted EIAR. Sites within the Zol are set out in Table 12.5 of the EIAR. I note for the attention of the Board the inclusion and consideration of North West Irish Sea c.SPA. See also section 7.0 'Appropriate Assessment' Section of this report above. All European Sites within the zone of influence of the proposed scheme are outlined and examined within the Appropriate Assessment Section of this report and will not be repeated hereunder. Sites within the Zol are highlighted in Table 12.5 of the EIAR. It is confirmed that, for the purposes of the EIAR, these European sites are all valued as being of International Importance. All other sites such as designated RAMSAR sites and Special Amenity Area Orders are recognised and considered in the context of the proposed development within the EIAR.
- 9.50. In order to establish biodiversity baseline conditions, the applicant carried out numerous walkovers of the site and carried out detailed mammal, bird, bat, reptile and amphibian surveys of the route and the surrounding areas. Habitat surveys were carried out by Scott Cawley Ltd. between June and August 2018 and August 2020. Confirmatory surveys were subsequently undertaken on the Proposed Scheme again in May 2022 to check and update the presence and extent of habitats found in the 2018 and 2020 habitat surveys. Aquatic habitat surveys were undertaken by Triturus Environmental Ltd. during July 2022.
- 9.51. As mentioned above habitats and species encountered are typical of that within developed urban environments of significance to the proposed development and I note that surveys and desk top studies did not record any evidence of the following within the development boundary of the proposed scheme: common lizard, common frog, smooth newt or marsh fritillary butterfly (in the study area). I also note that no red listed

mollusc species or white-clawed crayfish were recorded during the aquatic surveys conducted on the River Poddle or the Grand Canal.

#### Lamprey Species (Atlantic Salmon, Eel, Sea Trout)

- 9.52. The River Poddle has no populations of salmonids or any other fisheries interests due to extensive culverting in the lower section of the river proving impassable to any migratory species such as Atlantic salmon, lamprey, European eel or sea trout (SDCC 2020). There is one historical monitoring site on the River Poddle catchment which was surveyed by Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI) in September 2007. The monitoring location is at The Priory, Kimmage Road approximately 1km upstream of the Proposed Scheme at Kimmage Cross Roads. The River Poddle was assigned an Ecological Status for the period 2016-2021 of 'Poor' (EPA 2023). As such, the River Poddle is not considered further in regard to impacts upon fish species.
- 9.53. The Grand Canal is not considered suitable for lamprey species due to its lacustrine-like (lake-like) environment and so lamprey are not considered further in this assessment.

#### European Eel

- 9.54. European eel populations are valued as being of National Importance. The desk study returned records for European eel *Anguilla anguilla* on the Grand Canal. European eels were recorded along the Grand Canal by IFI during the eel monitoring programme conducted in 2011 (O'Leary et al. 2011). The Liffey Estuary serves as the natural linkage for European eel migrating between freshwater and marine environments (Central and Regional Fisheries Board 2008). The desk study returned no European eel records for the River Poddle. It is reported that the River Poddle has no populations of salmonids or any other fisheries interests (other than three spined stickleback) due to extensive culverting in the lower section of the river proving impassable to any migratory species such as Atlantic salmon, lamprey, European eel or sea trout (SDCC 2020). As such the River Poddle is not considered further in regard to impacts on European eel. European eel were not recorded during

surveys undertaken by Triturus Environmental Ltd., downstream of the Proposed Scheme's Grand Canal crossing point at Robert Emmet Bridge in 2022.

- 9.55. The Grand Canal is known as an angling destination and species present include common bream *Abramis brama*, tench *Tinca tinca*, common rudd *Scardinius erythrophthalmus*, common perch *Perca fluviatilis* and pike *Esox lucius*. It also has a population of non-native invasive roach *Rutilus rutilus*, a species listed on the Third Schedule of the Birds and Habitats Regulations (Waterways Ireland 2021). It is reported that the Grand Canal section from Dolphins Barn to Portobello has good stocks of tench particularly from the Parnell Road stretch to the 7th Lock at Portobello, whilst Pike and roach are also present (IFI 2020).
- 9.56. These species are valued as being of Local Importance (Higher Value).
- 9.57. The effects of habitat degradation as a result of effects on surface water quality during construction has the potential to result in a significant effect at the local level given the fact that the other fish species in question are common in Irish waters and not of conservation concern. I note that, mitigation measures have been designed to protect water quality during construction. I highlight that the implementation of SuDs measures will prevent additional sediment release to the river and other surrounding watercourses therefore protecting aquatic species from dis-improvements in water quality.

#### Invertebrates – Freshwater Molluscs

- 9.58. Owing to the culverted nature of the River Poddle and a lack of suitable substrate in aboveground sections, there is no suitable habitat for white-clawed crayfish within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme.
- 9.59. The desk study (see Appendix A12.1 in Volume 4 of this EIAR), returned records of three Red Listed freshwater molluscs, the Glutinous snail *Myxas glutinosa* and false orb pea mussel *Pisidium pseudosphaerium* at several locations on the Grand Canal between Drimnagh and Herbert Place in 2003, including a record downstream of Robert Emmet Bridge. The iridescent pea mussel *Pisidium pulchellum* was also recorded on the Grand Canal in 2003 at Herbert Place, approximately 1.5km from the

Proposed Scheme. The lake orb mussel *Musculium lacustre*, listed as 'Vulnerable', was recorded at the Grand Canal at Drimnagh in 2003, approximately 1.2km from the Proposed Scheme (NBDC Online Database 2022). Surveys undertaken by Triturus Environmental Ltd. (2021a) as part of the TII's Metrolink project recorded the glutinous snail and the false-orb pea mussel during surveys carried out at Charlemont, downstream of the Proposed Scheme's Grand Canal crossing point at Robert Emmet Bridge. This location I note is outside of the proposed scheme boundary.

- 9.60. By virtue of the design of the Proposed Scheme and / or the nature of watercourses intersected by it, I highlight that the Proposed Scheme will not result in the any direct permanent loss of aquatic habitat nor result in a barrier effect in respect of aquatic invertebrates.

#### Habitat Degradation – Surface Water

- 9.61. Habitat degradation as a result of effects on surface water during operation is not predicted to affect the conservation status of aquatic or wetland bird species and will therefore, not result in a significant negative effect, at any geographic scale.

#### Otter

- 9.62. As set out above in section 7.0 of this report the Wicklow Mountains SAC, which is located approximately 8.1km south of the Proposed Scheme, is the closest European site for which otter is the QI species. Typically, otter territories are within the range of 7.5km for females and up to 21km for males (O'Neill et al. 2009). The Proposed Scheme only interacts with the following watercourses: River Poddle and the Grand Canal. Whilst these watercourses lie within the typical territorial ranges of otters, none of them share any hydrological connection to the Wicklow Mountains SAC. It is the River Dodder which provides the key hydrological pathway between the Wicklow Mountains SAC and Dublin City. Given the separation which exists between the Wicklow Mountains SAC and the Proposed Scheme, the otter population in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme is regarded to be distinct to that of the SAC. Therefore, habitat degradation / effects on the QI otter population for

Wicklow Mountains SAC, as a result of hydrological impacts by the Proposed Scheme, can be excluded.

- 9.63. Notwithstanding the foregoing it is proposed to carry out preconstruction confirmatory surveys in order to ensure that such species are not affected by the proposed construction works. The implementation of SUDs will ensure the avoidance of habitat degradation for mammals that utilise the river banks. Such measures will also prevent additional sediment release to the river Poddle and Grand Canal and other surrounding watercourses therefore protecting aquatic species from dis-improvements in water quality.

#### Potential Impacts in relation to bats

- 9.64. Bat surveys were carried out across four bat survey seasons between 2018 and 2022 and at four transects within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme (see details in section 12.3.8.1 of EIAR) with the following species recorded:
- Leisler's bat
  - Common Pipistrelle
  - Soprano pipistrelle
  - Unidentified Pipistrelle Species
- 9.65. Leisler's bat was recorded in all of the four locations surveyed between 2018 and 2021; including Robert Emmet Bridge referred to as CBC0011BT001, Harold's Cross Park referred to as CBC0011BT002, Mount Argus Park referred to as CBC0011BT003 and Poddle Park referred to as CBC0011BT004. A total of 11 bat passes, attributed to Leisler's bat, were recorded in these locations between 2018 and 2021. It is important to note that no roost sites for Leisler's bat were recorded during any of the surveys for the Proposed Scheme. The desk study found that Leisler's bat is known to occur in the wider study area and utilise foraging habitat within the greater Dublin area.
- 9.66. Common pipistrelle bats were recorded in two of the four transects surveyed between 2018 and 2021. including at Robert Emmet Bridge referred to as CBC0011BT001 and

Poddle Park referred to as CBC0011BT004. A total of 24 bat passes, attributed to common pipistrelle bat, were recorded in these locations between 2018 and 2021. Common pipistrelle bat activity was highest at CBC0011BT001 (Robert Emmet Bridge) along the Grand Canal in 2018 with 15 recordings being attributed to this species, with a further seven recordings of this species at this location in 2021. There were no recordings of common pipistrelle activity in 2019 or 2020 at this location. Two recordings attributed to this species were made at CBC0011BT004 (Poddle Park); one in 2019 and one in 2020. The results of the bat surveys as they relate to the common pipistrelle bats are shown on Figure 12.6.1 in Volume 3 of this EIAR. No roost sites for common pipistrelle bat were recorded during any of the surveys for the Proposed Scheme.

- 9.67. Soprano pipistrelle bat was recorded at two of the four transects surveyed during 2020 and 2021; including at Harold's Cross Park referred to as CBC0011BT002 and at Robert Emmet Bridge referred to as CBC0011BT001. A total of 27 recordings of this bat species can be attributed to these two locations, 13 from 2020 and 14 from 2021. This species was not recorded at any survey location in 2018 or 2019. No roost sites for soprano pipistrelle bat were recorded during any of the surveys for the Proposed Scheme.
- 9.68. Unidentified pipistrelle bat passes were recorded in one location at Poddle Park which is referred to as CBC0011BT004 in 2018.
- 9.69. There are no confirmed bat roosts located within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme. A single Possible roosting feature (PRF) (CBC0011PRF001) lies within the Proposed Scheme Boundary, along the boundary of the proposed Construction Compound K2 at Our Lady's Hospice. This tree is being retained. A further three trees, containing PRFs, were identified, outside of the Proposed Scheme at Poddle Park and at Mount Argus Park. These will not be impacted by the Proposed Scheme. PRFs, are listed in Table 12.7 and shown on Figure 12.6.2 in Volume 3 of the EIAR. As the single PRF is being retained there is no potential in any direct harm or mortality risk to bats.



- 9.70. In term of habitat degradation and fragmentation it is stated that notwithstanding the fact that there is evidence of bats foraging and commuting within the study area, particularly at Robert Emmet Bridge and Poddle Park. All parts of the scheme which contain suitable habitat are likely to be within the Core Sustenance Zone (CSZ) of at least one bat roost. Considering the type of works proposed (e.g., upgrading of existing infrastructure for the most part), there is limited potential for the proposed scheme to act as a barrier to flight paths for bat species, as there will be no major changes to pre-existing habitats along most of the route.
- 9.71. It is acknowledged that the scheme will result in some loss and / or fragmentation of existing habitat used by local populations of commuting / foraging bats. Suitable habitat for foraging and / commuting bats within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme includes hedgerows and treelines, canals, rivers, areas of parkland, woodland and open grassland. Fragmentation of feeding habitat has the potential to disturb normal bat behavioural patterns, and thus adversely affect the ability of local bat populations to persist and reproduce, impacting on their local distribution and / or abundance. The barrier effect can manifest itself as soon as the site clearance phase commences, and the barrier itself is in the form of the cleared lands. The Proposed Scheme will result in the removal / fragmentation of small areas / strips of treelines which could all be used by local bats. These habitats constitute a landscape feature which could be used by foraging / commuting bats and their loss, will result in a reduction of foraging / commuting habitat for local bats in this area.
- 9.72. The area of the habitats which will be lost as a result of the Proposed Scheme is provided in Table 12.11 and shown in the Landscape General Arrangement Drawings (BCIDD-ROT-ENV\_LA-0011\_ML\_00-DR-LL-9001) in Volume 3 of the EIAR. I note that removal of suitable habitat for foraging and / commuting bats (e.g. scattered trees and parkland, dry meadows and grassy verges, scrub, mixed broadleaved woodland and treelines / hedgerows) within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme is calculated as 17 existing street trees, scattered along R137 Harold's Cross Road. This is not deemed significant, considering the extent of habitat loss, their location (adjacent to existing artificially lit roads in a highly disturbed urban environment) and the presence

and relative abundance of other similar habitats in the wider locality, which will not be impacted by the Proposed Scheme.

- 9.73. An additional potential impact to bats arises from the introduction of artificial lighting within suitable habitat may result in avoidance behaviour by bats and could prevent bats from accessing foraging areas or roosts and/ or result in bats taking more circuitous routes to get to foraging areas and hence potentially depleting energy reserves and result in abandonment of nearby roosts. Given the urban setting of these proposed site compounds, it is considered that bats in the area would be habituated to some level of artificial lighting and the impact of increased artificial lighting at construction compounds is considered to be significant at the local level only.
- 9.74. It is stated that construction works will typically be undertaken during normal daylight working hours, and therefore the requirement for lighting to accommodate construction works during night-time, in many areas where existing light levels are low, will be limited and is temporary.

#### Mitigation in relation to Bats

- 9.75. Mitigation measures proposed include, pre-construction surveys (of all trees identified as containing PRFs or not to be removed within the boundary of the Proposed Scheme shall be rechecked for PRFs), retention of vegetation and protection of trees with potential for roosting and the use of low lux directional lighting. There will be no additional lighting within 5m of any PRF tree during the Construction Phase. An application will then be made to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for a derogation licence to permit actions affecting bats or their roosts. After licence approval from the NPWS (which may include the necessity for additional mitigation measures to those recommended here) bats may be removed by a bat specialist licenced to handle bats and released in the area in the evening following capture; and only then will PRF trees be felled and this shall be undertaken 'in sections' where the section can be handled to avoid sudden movements or jarring of the sections. In addition to mitigation proposals that may arise as result of the pre-construction survey

(e.g. emergence surveys and confirmation of roost), it is proposed to install generalist / self-cleaning bat boxes for each PRF tree that is confirmed to be removed.

9.76. To mitigate loss of habitat, the following proposed planting will be incorporated into the Proposed Scheme:

- 117 trees planted;
- 165 m of proposed hedgerow;

9.77. Overall, given the limited level of bat activity within the vicinity of the proposed works, the absence of any roost sites and the mitigation measures proposed above, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in any bat mortality. I also note that works will be carried out during daytime hours, are temporary and will therefore not result in disturbance to emergence patterns in the area.

#### Badger

9.78. No evidence of badger (e.g., setts or evidence of badger activity) were recorded within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme, during the multi-disciplinary surveys undertaken. Despite this, badger are widely recorded throughout the GDA, often utilising public parks and residential gardens. The desk-study returned one record within 1km of the Proposed Scheme. This was a live sighting in a laneway off Rathgar Avenue, approximately 250m from the Proposed Scheme in 2012 (NBDC Online Database 2022). As such, it has been assumed that badger may occur in vegetated areas adjacent to the Proposed Scheme.

#### Mitigation in relation to Badger

9.79. To protect badgers from indirect harm during construction, where practicable, open excavations will be covered when not in use and backfilled as soon as practicable by the appointed contractor. Excavations will also be covered at night, where practicable, and any deep excavations which must be left open will have appropriate egress ramps in place to allow mammals to safely exit should they fall in.

9.80. Overall, given there were no signs of badger recorded within the vicinity of the proposed works, and the mitigation measures proposed above, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in any badger mortality. I also note that works will be carried out during daytime hours, are temporary and any nighttime light spill will be minimised.

#### Potential Impacts in relation to birds

9.81. It is important to note that the applicant has examined the potential for impacts to arise in relation to overwintering and breeding bird species within the Appropriate Assessment section of this report (see section 7.0 above) and as such in the interest of conciseness these details will not be repeated hereunder, and accordingly this section of the report should be read in conjunction with the Appropriate Assessment, above, in relation to SCI bird species.

9.82. No wintering bird surveys were carried out for the Proposed Scheme, as no European sites or ex-situ sites supporting wintering birds will be subject to habitat loss from the Proposed Scheme (See Section 12.3.1). The Proposed Scheme lies within 60m of the known wintering bird feeding site of Eamonn Ceannt Park. However, the Proposed Scheme will not result in habitat loss and will be separated from Eamonn Ceannt Park by an existing row of 2-storey houses along Sundrive Road and by existing vegetation and trees along the perimeter of the preferred amenity grassland feeding areas (playing pitches) within the Park, which provide significant screening to the adjacent Park. The proposed works in this area of Sundrive Road are considered to be minor, including provision of a cycleway and retention of existing surfaces.

9.83. The Proposed Scheme is not likely to affect the conservation status of breeding bird species and will not result in a significant negative effect, at any geographic scale.

#### Potential Impact in relation to Aquatic species

9.84. Habitat degradation in relation to surface water quality has also been examined in detail within the Appropriate Assessment and Water Section of this report and subject

to mitigation and the implementation of SuDs measures no significant impacts to water quality or aquatic species are expected.

#### Potential Impacts in relation to Plant Species

- 9.85. No protected plant species listed on the Flora (Protection) Order, 2015 were recorded within or in close proximity to the Proposed Scheme. The desktop study did not reveal any records for rare and / or protected species in close proximity to the Proposed Scheme. Therefore, there is no potential for impacts on rare / protected species, as a result of the operation of the Proposed Scheme.

#### Invasive Plant Species

- 9.86. There were no non-native invasive plant species listed on the Third Schedule of the Birds and Habitats Regulations identified along the Proposed Scheme. Sixteen areas of invasive plant species (Japanese knotweed, Himalayan balsam, Canadian Waterweed and three-cornered garlic, species) are present within close proximity to, the Proposed Scheme. Locations are listed in Appendix A12.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR and include locations: along the River Poddle and the Grand Canal.
- 9.87. It is acknowledged by the applicant that such species pose a significant threat to biodiversity and as such it is proposed to carry out preconstruction surveys. An Invasive Species Management Plan has been prepared to outline the strategy that will be adopted during the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme in order to manage and prevent the spread of the non-native invasive plant species. This approach is common practice and known to be effective in the management of invasive species. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development will not give rise to the spread of invasive species within or outside of the site boundaries.

#### Potential Impacts Operational Phase

- 9.88. There are no significant effects expected during the operational phase of the development in relation to biodiversity. Measures such as the implementation of SUDs, directional lighting to protect bats, addition of bat boxes and monitoring and a management plan for invasive plant species will prevent any impacts of significance from arising.

### Residual Impacts

- 9.89. It is important to note that the EIAR within section 12.6 outlines the residual likely significant effects of the proposed development on all birds, bats, mammals, aquatic and plant species. The Board should note as outlined above that no protected species with the exception of a small number of bats commuting were found within the works area which comprises an urban carriageway within the city and suburbs and mitigation in the form of pre-construction surveys, protection of waterways and water quality are considered to prevent significant impacts from arising to species.
- 9.90. In this context I draw the Board's attention to table 12.15 of the EIAR in which residual impacts are not expected to be significant.
- 9.91. Given the foregoing and having regard to the mitigation measures proposed to ensure no significant effects arise, I am satisfied that that effects of the scheme to biodiversity will not be significant.
- 9.92. I note DCCs requirement in relation to the restriction of vegetation removal during the bird breeding season and am satisfied that this can be adequately dealt with by way of condition.
- 9.93. Thus having regard to the foregoing, and having considered the written submissions made in relation to biodiversity and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts on biodiversity can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect significant impacts on biodiversity can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

Table 11 Biodiversity - Summary of potential & residual effects

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
<b>Construction Phase on European sites</b>	Likely significant effect at the international geographic scale	Refer to section 9.5.1 for the range of mitigation measures which will be adapted at specific working areas to reduce impacts upon biodiversity.  See also CEMP, for fuels to be stored in bunded areas, no stockpiling near watercourse, Implementation of SUDs measures and attenuation.	No significant residual effect.
<b>Construction Phase Local biodiversity</b>	Likely significant effect at the local geographic scale	Pre construction surveys, protection of trees and vegetation.	No significant residual effect.
<b>Operational Phase on European Sites</b>	Likely significant effect at the international geographic scale	Implementation of SUDs measures and attenuation.	No significant residual effect.
<b>Operational phase Local biodiversity</b>	Potential for Likely significant effect at the international geographic scale	Implementation of SUDs measures and attenuation. Directional lighting and monitoring and management of invasive plant species.	No significant residual effect.

## Water

9.94. Section 13 of the EIAR submitted examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to hydrology. As outlined above in section 3.0 of this report, the proposed scheme is

essentially an upgrade to the existing bus priority and cycle facilities along the R817 Kimmage Road Lower, from Kimmage Cross Roads (KCR) to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road, from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal and from Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street to the Patrick Street Junction. The proposed Kimmage to City Centre Core Bus Corridor (CBC) Scheme has an overall length of approximately 3.7 km. The study area lies within Hydrometric Area (HA) 09 (Liffey and Dublin Bay) and is within the River Liffey catchment. The Liffey and Dublin Bay Catchment Summary (Liffey Catchment Assessment 2010 – 2015 (HA 09) (EPA 2018) describes this catchment as including the area drained by the River Liffey and by all streams entering tidal water between Sea Mount and Sorrento Point, County Dublin, draining a total area of 1,616km<sup>2</sup>. There are two main waterbodies within the study area in this catchment: the Poddle\_010 and the Grand Canal Main Line. The largest urban centre in the catchment is Dublin City. The other main urban centres relevant to the study area are Kimmage, Harold's Cross, Perrystown and Crumlin. The Liffey and Dublin Bay catchment contains the largest population (approximately 1,255,000) of any catchment in Ireland and is characterised by a sparsely populated, upland south eastern area underlain by granites and a densely populated, flat, low lying limestone area over the remainder of the catchment basin. The majority of the population in the catchment is in this low-lying limestone area which is also heavily urbanised and industrialised.

#### Baseline Conditions

9.95. The waterbodies examined for the purpose of EIA for the proposed scheme include the following:

- The Poddle\_010; and
- Grand Canal (Grand Canal Main Line (Liffey and Dublin Bay))

9.96. The WFD Status of the Poddle (at risk) and Grand Canal (not at risk) within the study area of the Proposed Scheme are detailed in Table 13.7 of the EIAR.

9.96.1. As set out previously, the proposed scheme crosses the river Poddle and the Grand Canal.



9.97. I draw the Board's attention to Appendix A13.1 in Vol 4 of the EIAR which contains a Water Framework Directive Assessment report. It is concluded within this report that the proposed scheme will not compromise progress towards achieving GES (Good Ecological Status) or cause a deterioration of the overall GEP (Good Ecological Potential) of any of the water bodies that are in scope. The WFD also requires consideration of how a new scheme might impact on other water bodies and other EU legislation. The following assessment will examine the potential for the proposed development to impact waterbodies within the study area. The Board should note that an Appropriate Assessment has been carried out as outlined above and considers the impact to other EU legislation accordingly.

#### Potential Construction Impacts

9.98. The potential for impacts to arise in relation to these water bodies is summarised hereunder and the magnitude of any effects stated. The Board should note that the effects listed hereunder relate to the construction phase of the development, operational effects will be considered separately.

- **Poddle\_010.** The Poddle\_010 rises in Bancroft Park in Tallaght and flows towards Dublin City via Tymon Park and Mount Argus. It is constrained by significant culverting along its length or is within concrete channels. The Poddle\_010 is approximately 10.13km, joining the Liffey Estuary Upper at Wellington Quay, upstream of Father Mathew Bridge. The Proposed Scheme will directly cross the water body four times; these are existing road crossings of the Poddle\_010. The Poddle\_010 is culverted for approximately 3km from Mount Jerome up to its outfall to the Liffey Estuary Upper. The Poddle\_010 has a Poor status and is At Risk of not achieving Good Status by 2027. Significant pressures include urban runoff from diffuse sources causing nutrient and organic pollution, as well as hydromorphological impacts as a result of significant culverting.
  - New Stone Boat Boardwalk at Mount Argus View – potential increased sediment in runoff and anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.).

- Construction Compound K1 at Sundrive Road – potential anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.)
- Junction improvements, installation of cycle tracks, traffic signals and changes to lanes within the existing roads from Kimmage Cross Roads to Ravensdale Park – Minimal surface water run-off, minimal sediment in runoff, minimal anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.) and culverted water body therefore little potential for impacts.
- Road widening at Harold's Cross Road – potential increased silty water runoff.
- Construction Compound K2 - potential of increased silty water runoff and spillage of noxious materials.
- New pedestrian bridge at Robert Emmet Bridge – Increased surface water runoff; Increased sediment in runoff; Anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.)
- Construction Compound K3 – potential minimal surface water runoff; minimal sediment in runoff; minimal anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.)
- Pavement repairs, revised road markings and new cycle tracks at R137 New Street South – potential minimal surface water runoff; minimal sediment in runoff; minimal anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.)

Magnitude of effects – **Adverse, Significant and short term / Adverse, Imperceptible and Short-Term / No Impact / Adverse, Profound and Short to Medium Term.**

- **Grand Canal (Grand Canal Main Line (Liffey and Dublin Bay))** - is an artificial waterbody, primarily used for recreation. Constructed in the 18th century, the grand Canal traverses the country from Dublin to Shannon for approximately 131km. The Proposed Scheme will cross the Grand Canal at Rober Emmet Bridge/ R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper. Good Ecological Potential.

- New cycle / pedestrian bridges, widening and retaining wall at Robert Emmet Bridge / R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper – potential hydrocarbon release through damage to high voltage Oil Filled Cable.
- New cycle / pedestrian bridges, widening and retaining wall at Robert Emmet Bridge / R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper – potential increased sediment in runoff and anthropogenic sources (fuel etc.)

Magnitude of effects - **Adverse, Profound and Short to Medium Term -Term / No impact.**

#### Potential Operational impacts

9.99. The potential impacts for the Operational Phase are related to deterioration in water quality and hydromorphology only.

- Deterioration in water quality from increased levels of 'routine' road contaminates, such as hydrocarbons, metals, sediment and chloride (seasonal) due to:
  - Potential increases in pollution and sediment loads entering surface water receptors from new or widened roads;
  - Increased impermeable area, and changes to the nature, frequency and numbers of vehicles using the new routes of the Proposed Scheme; and
  - Dispersal of traffic onto other side roads, which may drain to a different catchment or have less stringent pollution control infrastructure.
- There is the potential for hydromorphology changes due to:
  - Changes in the flow regime due to increased surface water runoff or discharges in new locations, resulting in changes to sedimentation processes and the structure of riverbanks.

No potential changes to hydrology are predicted as the drainage design ensures no net increase in runoff rates. The magnitude of effects to the waterbodies listed above is of imperceptible significance. The Board should note that it is proposed to incorporate SUDs measures (attenuation tanks and swales) into the proposed scheme along the entirety of its length. Such works will have a positive impact on the receiving waters surrounding the proposed scheme.

- **Poddle\_010.** The Poddle\_010 receives surface water from a number of surface water discharge points along its course with the southern section of the Proposed Scheme mainly draining to the Poddle\_010. There would be an increase of approximately 199m<sup>2</sup> in the impermeable area of the Poddle\_010 catchment as a result of the proposed pedestrian and cycleway over the Stone Boat in Mount Argus Park. This is proposed to be constructed of a mesh material to allow views of the Stone Boat and reduce the run off rate. There will, therefore, be no impact on the Poddle\_010 from this footpath. The remaining impermeable area will be managed using infiltration trenches. The potential impact on the Poddle\_010 will be of negligible magnitude.

Magnitude of effects: **Adverse, Imperceptible and Short Term.**

- **Grand Canal (Grand Canal Main Line (Liffey and Dublin Bay))** - No direct hydrological connection from the Proposed Scheme to the Grand Canal during the Operational Phase, therefore there are no impacts from that source.

Magnitude of effects: **No Impact.**

9.100. It is important to acknowledge that there will be additional traffic flows on diverted routes both during the construction and operation of the phases of the proposed scheme. I have considered such changes and agree with the conclusions in this regard that the proposed development would result in an imperceptible impact to the water environment within these areas and will therefore not give rise to significant environmental effects.

9.101. Overall, I have considered the submissions and the contents of the application in relation to water and am satisfied having regard to the existing baseline environment and proposed mitigation measures that there will be no significant residual impacts on the hydrological environment within or connected to the proposed scheme.

#### Flooding

9.102. The applicant has carried out a flood risk assessment for the proposed scheme which is appended in Appendix A13.2 (Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment in Volume 4 of the EIAR. It is noted that a stage 2 FRA was not required as the development will not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities and will be flood resilient in design.

9.103. The primary source of flood risk identified for the Proposed Scheme corridor is from fluvial flooding from the adjacent River Poddle. Sections of the Proposed Scheme have been identified to be within Flood Zone A. The Proposed Scheme is categorised as local transport infrastructure according to the FRM Guidelines (DEHLG and OPW 2009). The Justification Test has been designed to rigorously assess the appropriateness, or otherwise, of particular developments that, are being considered in areas of moderate or high flood risk (i.e. Zone A and B). The assessment undertaken as part of the FRA indicates that the Proposed Scheme will have a negligible impact on flooding and the surface water drainage network within the catchment. SuDS will be provided, where applicable, to manage runoff quantity and quality.

9.104. The following is a summary of the potential for flooding along the scheme and the overall impact of the development in relation to each flood type.

9.105. **Pluvial Flooding** – There is a risk of pluvial flooding along the entire length of the proposed route. However, this risk will be reduced as a result of the Proposed Scheme. The scheme will result in the creation of additional impermeable surfaces for local sections of road widening. However, SuDS measures have been included, as a consequence of the scheme. This will ensure no increase in the risk of pluvial flooding as a result of the Proposed Scheme.

**9.106. Fluvial Flooding** – The site is located approximately 10 km from the nearest coastal boundary and elevated high above sea level. There is therefore no risk of coastal flooding to the site in the present, or future climate change scenario. The Proposed Scheme requires minimal changes to land cover and will likely have a negligible impact on the existing fluvial flood regime. The Proposed Scheme will not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities and will be flood resilient in design.

**9.107. Climate Change** – There will be an increased risk of fluvial flooding to the Proposed Scheme as a consequence of climate change, however, the Proposed Scheme will not exacerbate the impacts of climate change on the risk of fluvial flooding.

#### Conclusion

9.108. With regard to the foregoing, I have reviewed the drainage implications of the proposed development and note that the drainage design will ensure no net increase in surface water flow discharges. New surface water sewers are designed to provide attenuation for return period of up to 30 years where possible and the introduction of SuDs measures along the route will contribute to the management of fluvial flooding risk through the provision of surface water storage capacity in the network. The overall impacts in relation to flooding and water quality are positive along the route of the proposed scheme.

9.109. Mitigation measures proposed to control sediments, restrict storage of fuels to bunded areas and restrict the method of concrete use near to water bodies will ensure that accidental sediment and hydrocarbon release to waterbodies does not arise. The proposed scheme is expected to have an overall positive impact on water quality and is therefore in compliance with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive in that it will not cause a deterioration in status in any waterbody or prevent any waterbody from achieving good status.

9.110. I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to water and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts on water can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form

part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on water can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

*Table 12 Water - Summary of potential & residual effects*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
<p>Increased sediment in run off;</p> <p>Contamination of water bodies with anthropogenic substances such oil, chemicals or concrete washings.</p> <p>Anthropogenic sources (fuel etc);</p> <p>Increased scouring of watercourse</p> <p>Concrete washings.</p> <p>Re-exposure of historically settled contaminants</p>	<p>Adverse, Significant and Short-Term / Imperceptible – moderate / slight to moderate / Significant to moderate</p>	<p>A Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) has been prepared (See CEMP)</p> <p>– Construction Compounds Management including the storage of fuels and materials; to be stored in bunded areas no stockpiling near watercourse, management of vehicles and plant including refuelling and wheel wash facilities; and monitoring.</p> <p>The pouring of concrete will take place in dry weather only.</p> <p>Silt fences or similar will be installed to prevent overland flow</p>	<p>None of any significance, Permanent beneficial Imperceptible</p>

		into the canal or the Liffey Estuary Lower.  Implementation of SUDs measures and attenuation.  Monitoring.	
--	--	---	--

## **Land, soil, geology and hydrogeology**

9.111. Section 14 of the EIAR submitted addresses lands, soils, geology and hydrogeology.

### Baseline Conditions

9.112. The land uses in the region are mainly comprised of urban developments including but not limited to; industrial, commercial, residential and recreational. Moving away from the City Centre there are also marine, agricultural and forested areas in the region. Geomorphology and topography are examined within the EIAR in order to give context to any potential changes to land, soils, geology, and hydrogeology that could influence the importance of a feature and the magnitude of any impacts.

9.113. The topography of the region is dominated by the Wicklow Mountains to the south with undulating topography to the north, west and east with localised highs generally synonymous with outcropping rock or near surface bedrock. There is a gradual drop in elevation across the region from west to east approaching the coast. The topography of the proposed scheme is approximately 50mOD and 40mOD at Kimmage Cross Roads. This gradually falls to approximately 30mOD at the R817 Kimmage Road / R137 Harold's Cross Road Junction. The River Poddle runs parallel to the west of the Proposed Scheme corridor.

9.114. Most of the soils expected to be encountered within the study area are made ground comprising varying forms of hard standing materials including road pavements and footpaths. However, there are topsoil and other soils present within the study area. Pockets of topsoil are identified in the subsection from Kimmage Road Lower at Kimmage Crossroads to the Junction with R137 Harold's Cross Road. Here, the



Proposed Scheme will intersect the topsoil deposits at the junction of St. Martin's Park and R817 Kimmage Road Lower, to the west of the Proposed Scheme along St. Martin's Drive and to the east of the Proposed Scheme underlying the estate at Kimmage Grove.

9.115. Given the urban setting of the proposed development, it was considered prudent to examine the potential for contaminated lands to be present within the route of the scheme. A number of sites were identified which included uses such as old quarries, petrol service stations, old paper mills, oil works, Gordon's Fuel, underground cables, Dispensary, Mount Jerome Cemetery, Distillery, Graveyard, Chemical works, Meath Hospital, Lime works, Tannery, Contaminated soils (Asbestos and exceedances of PAH were found in CP03 near the Stoneboat Bridge above the inert waste levels & Hazardous classed samples for waste acceptance criteria along the Proposed Scheme for high levels of pH), all are outlined within Table 14.23 of the EIAR.

#### Potential Construction Impacts

9.116. It must be stated at the outset that no significant impacts are expected to arise in relation to land, soil, geology and hydrogeology. Impacts are expected to occur in relation to the following:

- **Loss or damage of topsoil** – works giving rise to potential effects – contamination of soils due to spillage of concrete/hydrocarbons/bitumen sealants etc, excavations and soil stripping and construction machinery – magnitude of effects is expected to be **slight**.
- **Excavation of potentially contaminated ground** – historic quarries, petrol stations, a paper mill, oil works, underground cables and Gordon's Fuels resulting in exposure of contaminated material – magnitude of effects is described as small adverse as it results in the excavation of a small proportion of contaminated land. The resulting significance of the permanent small adverse impact will be **slight**
- **Loss of future quarry or pit reserve** –

The sterilisation of land through development, or the excavation of soil and rock during construction, can diminish future quarry and pit reserves, which have been shown to have been utilised in the past in the area, such as the historic quarries on R817 Kimmage Road Lower.

Magnitude of effects is expected to be **negligible**.

- **Loss or damage of proportion of Geological Heritage Area** - River Poddle CGS - Magnitude of impact **Imperceptible**.
- **Loss or damage of proportion of aquifer** - Locally Important Aquifer (LI), minimal excavation into the limestone rock as part of the Proposed Scheme – magnitude of impact **Moderate**.
- **Change to groundwater regime** - Locally Important Aquifer (LI) pumping is expected to be limited, localised and temporary – magnitude of effects – **Imperceptible**.

#### Potential Operational Impacts

9.117. The Operational Phase has the potential to lead to occasional accidental leakage of oil, petrol or diesel, allowing contamination of the surrounding environment. The magnitude of the impact is **negligible**.

9.118. Standard mitigation measures are proposed in relation to the protection of soils, geology and geomorphology during construction and are outlined in section 14.5 of the EIAR and the CEMP accompanying the application. No additional mitigation measures are deemed necessary for the operational phase of the development. Consequently subject to the implementation of construction mitigation no residual effects are expected.

9.119. Cumulative impacts have been considered in this regard and given the nature of the proposed works are considered to be unlikely.

#### Conclusion

I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to lands, soils, geology and hydrogeology and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I

am satisfied that the potential for impacts on lands, soil, geology and hydrogeology can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on lands, soils, geology and hydrogeology can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

*Table 13 Land, Soils, geology & hydrogeology - Summary of potential & residual effects*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
Loss or damage of topsoil	Slight	Prevention of leaks and spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals.	Imperceptible
Disturbance of contaminated land	Slight	Licensed contractor will remove and dispose at licensed facility if encountered. Dewatering in such areas will be carried out in manner that reduces mobilisation of contaminants.	Imperceptible
Loss of future quarry or pit reserve	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
Loss or damage of proportion of aquifer	Imperceptible	Ensure that all areas where liquids (including fuel) are stored, or cleaning is carried out, are in	Imperceptible

		<p>designated impermeable areas that are isolated from the surrounding area and within a secondary containment system.</p> <p>The location of any fuel storage facilities shall be considered in the design of the Construction Compound.</p>	
<b>Loss or damage of proportion of Geological Heritage Area</b>	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
<b>Change to groundwater regime</b>	Imperceptible	<p>All concrete mixing and batching activities will be located in areas away from watercourses and drains.</p> <p>Prevention of leaks and spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals.</p>	Imperceptible

## **Archaeology, Cultural Heritage & Architectural Heritage**

9.120. Section 15 & 16 of the EIAR submitted examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to Archaeology & Cultural Heritage and Architectural Heritage.

### **Baseline Conditions - Archaeology & Cultural Heritage**

9.121. In terms of baseline conditions with regard to monuments, archaeology and cultural heritage I refer the board to Section 15.3 of the EIAR in which the historical baseline conditions are outlined. It is clear from the information submitted that the area surrounding the proposed route has been a hive of activity for centuries and is rich in archaeology and cultural heritage.

9.122. For the purpose of assessment, the scheme has been divided into three distinct sections:

- Section 1: Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road
- Section 2: Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal
- Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.

9.123. I note that a summary of the architectural heritage assets in the receiving environment of the Proposed Scheme have been grouped into the following categories, as set out in Chapter 16 – Architectural Heritage of the submitted EIAR:

- Section 16.3.1.1 World Heritage Sites;
- Section 16.3.1.2 Archaeological Heritage Sites of Archaeological Significance;
- Section 16.3.1.3 Protected Structures;
- Section 16.3.1.4 Architectural Conservation Areas;
- Section 16.3.1.5 Conservation Areas;
- Section 16.3.1.6: NIAH Structures;

- Section 16.3.1.7 Designed Landscapes;
- Section 16.3.1.8 Industrial Heritage Sites;
- Section 16.3.1.9 Other Structures of Architectural Heritage Interest; and
- Section 16.3.1.10 Street Furniture.

Section 1: Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road

9.124. There are no national monuments or sites under Preservation Order within or in the vicinity of section 1 of the Proposed Scheme.

9.125. The Proposed Scheme will traverse the ZAP for a section of the City Watercourse associated with milling activity at the Kimmage Cross Roads and along Kimmage Road Lower (RMP DU022-00301 and DU022-00302) and at another section of the City Watercourse at Mount Argus Road (RMP DU018-043004). Four RMP/ SMR Sites are located within the Proposed Scheme (Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road Section) – two watercourses, a mill race and a weir – regulating. (see Table 15.4: RMP / SMR Sites within the Proposed Scheme). At Mount Argus Way, the Proposed Scheme will include a boardwalk over the River Poddle in the vicinity of the stone boat, and a weir (RMP DU018-043003) associated with the City Watercourse (RMP DU018-043004).

9.126. A total of three RMP / SMR sites are located within 50m of this section of the Proposed Scheme comprising a windmill site, a mill site and a mill pond site (see Table 15.5: RMP / SMR Sites within the Proposed Scheme).

9.127. Along the Lower Kimmage Road section of the Proposed Scheme there are a number of former mill sites and former quarry sites. There is a site of a corn mill and flour mill at Ravensdale Park on Kimmage Road (DCIHR 22- 02-011). Along Saint Martin's Park in the vicinity of the proposed cycle route, there is a quarry (DCIHR 22-02-005). This quarry is no longer visible and has since been filled in and built over.

Three sites are located adjacent to the Harold's Cross Road section of the Proposed Scheme, to the south-west of the entrance to Mount Jerome Cemetery, Table 15.6 sets out the Industrial Heritage Sites within 50m of the Proposed Scheme (for the Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road Section). Only one of these survives in situ, the Monumental Works associated with the cemetery. All industrial heritage sites are detailed and assessed in Appendix 15.2 (Inventory of Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Sites) of Volume 4 of the EIAR.

9.128. As stated above the Proposed Scheme and its associated cycling route will encounter sections of the City Watercourse / River Poddle along its length. Elements associated with it such as weirs and milling activity are located in the vicinity. The River Poddle was important as the supply of water to the medieval city of Dublin. The proposed cycle route will travel via a proposed boardwalk, over a feature known as The Tongue or Stone Boat (RMP DU018-043003); now reconstructed. This comprises a wedge-shaped pier of stone constructed at the junction of the River Poddle and the City Watercourse. This was built in an attempt to regulate the quantity of water reaching the city via the City Watercourse. The boardwalk deck will be perforated such that the Stone Boat will be visible through it.

#### Section 2: Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal.

9.129. There are no National Monuments or sites under preservation order within or in the vicinity of this section of the Proposed Scheme.

9.130. The Proposed Scheme will travel along existing roads, through a heavily developed suburban and urban landscape, and will traverse the ZAP for Harold's Cross, an historic suburb. There is one recorded archaeological monument, Harolds Cross settlement, within this section of the Proposed Scheme, and a further four located within 50m. The sites within this section of the Proposed Scheme comprise of a mill, a watermill, maypole site and Gallows. Tables 15.7 and 15.8 of the EIAR set out

RMP Sites within section 2 of the proposed scheme and sites within 50m of the proposed scheme, respectively.

- 9.131. There are two industrial heritage sites located within this section of the proposed scheme. Tramway (site of)) and Robert Emmet Bridge (canal bridge). Only one of which, Robert Emmet Bridge (canal bridge), is upstanding (and is recorded on the NIAH record as NIAH 50080983)

Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.

- 9.132. The northern-most portion of the Proposed Scheme, from the junction with Lombard Street West, on Clanbrassil Street Lower, New Street and Kevin Street Upper, lies within the ZAP for Dublin's historic city (RMP DU018-020)
- 9.133. Table 15.12 of the EIAR sets out the RMP Sites within the Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction section of the scheme. These include Historic Town: Dublin City ZAP, House – 18<sup>th</sup> / 19<sup>th</sup> Century and Mill – unclassified.
- 9.134. Table 15.13 of the EIAR sets out a further 15 RMP sites within 50m of the Proposed Scheme (Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction Section), Within the Dublin City ZAP.
- 9.135. Summaries of archaeological investigations on or adjacent to the Proposed Scheme are outlined in Appendix A15.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR.
- 9.136. There are two recorded industrial heritages site within this section of the Proposed Scheme (Tramway & a Weaving Mill).

Construction Compounds

- 9.137. Construction Compound K1 is located in a carpark off Sundrive Road this area has a tarmacadam surface. The location proposed for Construction Compound K2 is located within the grounds of Our Lady's Hospice in greenfield / grass topped environment. Construction Compound K3 is located on the western side of



Clanbrassil Street Lower at St Patrick's Court, the area has been previously built up and redeveloped and presents as a raised green and paved area.

9.138. There are no national monuments or sites under Preservation Order within or in the vicinity of the proposed construction compounds.

9.139. No features of an industrial heritage nature will be disturbed by the proposed locations for the Construction Compounds.

9.140. There are no cultural heritage interest within or in the vicinity of the proposed Construction Compounds.

#### Protected Structures and their settings

9.141. One hundred and four protected structures were identified in the study area, as outlined in Section 16.3.1.3 of the EIAR, and described in Appendix A16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites in Volume 4 of the EIAR. They are of Medium and High Sensitivity. It is predicted that only one of the 104 protected structures identified in the study area will be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme. Land acquisition is proposed to the north of the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice, Greenmount House, Harold's Cross Road (DCC RPS 3581). The land take will directly affect the rusticated granite north pier of the main entrance gates to the Hospice. The piers are protected structures of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity, as they are part of the curtilage of the Hospice. This land take will necessitate the removal and repositioning of the pier and part of the granite curtain wall. There is potential for damage to the remaining portion of the curtain wall from the removal of a gate pier and part of the curtain wall. The proposal will also impact the entrance gates visually. The pier and curtain wall will be reinstated on a like for like basis. The magnitude of impact is Medium. The potential Construction Phase impact will be Direct, Negative, Moderate and Temporary.

9.142. The EIAR indicates that there are 88 RMP sites identified within the study area of the Proposed Scheme. The RMP sites are generally rated of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity except for St. Patrick's Cathedral, Patrick Street (RMP DU018-020269) which is of National Importance and High

Sensitivity. Protected Structures are listed in Table 16.7 of the EIAR with further information provided in Appendix A.16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

- 9.143. The proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk will be located at a regulating weir, the Stone Boat (RMP DU018-043003). The deck or platform of the proposed Stone Boat Boardwalk will be supported on concrete piles which will be located between two existing retaining walls to the north of the Stone Boat. The weir is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. There is potential for damage to the weir during construction, the magnitude of which is Medium. The potential Construction Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Temporary.
- 9.144. Construction Compound K3, which will be located on R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower, will have a temporary adverse and indirect visual impact on the setting of 29 Clanbrassil Street Lower (DCC RPS 1857) during the Construction Phase. The magnitude of impact is Low. The building is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The potential Construction Phase impact is Indirect, Negative, Slight and Temporary.
- 9.145. Indirect physical Construction Phase impacts are anticipated in 100 locations, where protected structures of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity share a boundary with the Proposed Scheme. They are outlined in Section 16.3.1.3 and described in Appendix A16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites in Volume 4 of this EIAR. The structures are of Medium Sensitivity. None of these features will be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme, but there is potential for damage during construction. The magnitude of impact is Medium. The potential Construction Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Temporary.

#### Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs)

- 9.146. Only one ACA was identified in the study area, as outlined in Section 16.3.1.4. The southern end of the Thomas Street ACA abuts the study area but will not be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme. Thomas Street ACA includes the northern side of R110 Dean Street and Francis Street. The installation of the proposed concrete

paving, removal and replacement of trees and planting and urban realm works to R137 New Street South will not directly impact the ACA but will have an adverse and indirect visual impact on the ACA during the Construction Phase. The magnitude of impact is Low. Significant fabric within Thomas Street ACA includes 77 Francis Street (DCC RPS 2942). Street furniture includes a post box (NIAH 50080638) and lamp posts, including a reproduction Rathmines type lamp post (CBC0809LP028). The ACA is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The potential Construction Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Slight and Temporary.

#### Conservation Areas (CAs)

9.147. A review of the Dublin City Development Plan (DCC 2022) indicates that the Proposed Scheme will traverse through one Conservation Area and will terminate within another. The Grand Canal Conservation Area and Patrick Street Conservation Area are listed in Table 16.9 of the EIAR.

9.148. With respect to Policy BHA10 of the Dublin City Development Plan, it should be noted that there are demolition works proposed at Gordon's Fuels as part of the Proposed Scheme. The demolition works comprise the deconstruction of one small residential cottage dwelling. However, this building (and its surrounds comprising fuel merchants and scrap yard businesses) does not have any architectural heritage merit or status and are not considered to contribute to the character or surrounds of the Grand Canal Conservation Area. There are no equivalent Conservation Areas in the South Dublin County Development Plan (SDCC 2022).

Inspectors Note:

Policy BHA9 states:

'To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible. Enhancement opportunities may include:

1. Replacement or improvement of any building, feature or element which detracts from the character of the area or its setting.
2. Re-instatement of missing architectural detail or important features.
3. Improvement of open spaces and the wider public realm and reinstatement of historic routes and characteristic plot patterns.
4. Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.
5. Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.

Changes of use will be acceptable where in compliance with the zoning objectives and where they make a positive contribution to the character, function and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting. The Council will consider the contribution of existing uses to the special interest of an area

Policy BHA10 states:

‘There is a presumption against the demolition or substantial loss of a structure that positively contributes to the character of a Conservation Area, except in exceptional circumstances where such loss would also contribute to a significant public benefit’.

- 9.149. Potential direct impacts within the Grand Canal Conservation Area will include the repositioning of kerbs at 1 to 15 Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH167, odd numbers only) and on Robert Emmet Bridge (CBC0011BTH135, CBC0011BTH136) which are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The repositioning of kerbs will carry a potential risk of damage during the Construction Phase. The magnitude of the impact is High. The potential Construction Phase impact on the Conservation Area will be Direct, Negative, Significant and Temporary.
- 9.150. Potential direct impacts within the Grand Canal Conservation Area will also include the proposed new cycle / pedestrian bridges on either side of Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and alterations to the end walls of the bridge itself which is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The alterations to the bridge and the

supporting piers beside the tow paths of the Grand Canal (CBC0011BTH042) will have a direct impact on the Conservation Area and its character. The Grand Canal Conservation Area is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The magnitude of the impact is Medium. The potential Construction Phase impact on the Conservation Area will be Direct, Negative, Moderate and Long-Term.

9.151. The retaining walls on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080982) are also partly located within the Grand Canal Conservation Area and are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The proposed land take and road widening to accommodate the northbound bus corridor, a cycle track and footpath on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper will result in the burial or removal of two cut limestone retaining walls on the west side of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper. The walls and steps are part of a group of three walls which were built in 1790 and form part of an integrated group with Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and the Grand Canal (CBC0011BTH042). The two walls will be replaced by a new modern wall with masonry facing and there will be a long-term impact on the character of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper which will be visibly wider and also on the character of the Conservation Area. The magnitude of the impact is High. The potential Construction Phase impact on the Conservation Area will be Direct, Negative, Significant and Long-Term.

9.152. Significant fabric within the Grand Canal Conservation Area includes 1 to 15 Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH156, odd numbers only), 77 Grove Road (NIAH 50081042), 34 to 35 Clanbrassil Street Upper (CBC0011BTH046), cellar hatches at 1 to 15 Harold's Cross Road (CBC0011BTH157 to CBC0011BTH166), and cellar hatches at 34 to 35 Clanbrassil Street Upper (CBC0011BTH169). None of these features will be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme, but there is potential for damage during construction. The magnitude of impact is Medium. The Grand Canal Conservation Area is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The potential Construction Phase impact on the Conservation Area will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Temporary. Significant fabric within the Patrick Street Conservation Area includes the public convenience on the corner at the junction with R110 Kevin

Street Upper (DCC RPS 5822), a Dutch Billy at 35a Kevin Street Upper (RMP DU018- 020405), St. Patrick's Cathedral Grammar School at 39 Kevin Street Upper (DCC RPS 4187), 51 to 53 Patrick Street (DCC RPS 6440 to DCC RPS 6442), St. Patrick's Cathedral Choir School / College of the Vicar's Choral at 53 Patrick Street (RMP DU018-020800), St. Patrick's Cathedral (RMP DU018-020269) and street furniture including lamp posts (CBC0809LP031, CBC0011LP031). The Patrick Street Conservation Area is of National Importance and High Sensitivity. None of these features will be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme, but there is the potential for damage during construction. The magnitude of impact is Medium. The potential Construction Phase impact on the Conservation Area will be Indirect, Negative, Significant and Temporary.

#### NIAH Structures

9.153. A review of the NIAH Building Survey for Dublin (NIAH 2020a) has shown that in addition to the recorded monuments and protected structures noted in Section 16.3.1.3, there are 27 NIAH structures or groups of structures located in the study area of the Proposed Scheme. They are rated of Local and Regional Importance by the NIAH and are of Low to Medium Sensitivity and are included in Table 16.10 and are described in detail in Appendix A16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

9.154. Potential direct impacts to NIAH structures include the proposed new cycle / pedestrian bridges at Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) which are to be built running parallel to the existing bridge to accommodate a footpath and cycle tracks to the west and a footpath to the east. The Robert Emmet Bridge is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The new bridges will be independent of Robert Emmet Bridge. The main portion of the bridge including the lamps and memorial to Robert Emmet will be retained in-situ. The new bridges will have a direct impact on the curving end walls of Robert Emmet Bridge. The end walls on the south side and east side were built as part of the bridge. Part of the end wall on the north-west side was built in the 1930s but the northern end is part of a retaining wall (NIAH 50080982) built in the 1790s. Their removal will represent a loss of historic fabric.

The decks of the proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges will be supported on piles located beside the north and south tow paths of the Grand Canal (CBC0011BTH042) on either side of the existing bridge. The magnitude of the impact is Medium. The potential Construction Phase impact on Robert Emmet Bridge, its end walls and the canal tow path, as a result of proposed works to the bridge and the canal tow path will be Direct, Negative, Moderate and Long-Term.

- 9.155. Potential direct impacts to NIAH structures will also arise from the replacement and repositioning of retaining walls and steps on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080982). The proposed land take and road widening to accommodate the northbound bus corridor, a cycle track and footpath on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper will result in the removal of two cut limestone retaining walls and a set of steps on the west side of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080982). There will be a long-term impact on the character of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper, which will be visibly wider. The magnitude of the impact is High. The potential Construction Phase impact will be Direct, Negative, Significant and Long-Term.
- 9.156. The location of Construction Compound K2 and the creation of a car park in the grounds of Our Lady's Hospice, may indirectly impact the adjoining house to the south, 66 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH 50081060) as a result of the potential for damage during the Construction Phase. The magnitude of impact is Medium. The house is of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The potential Construction Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Temporary.
- 9.157. Five NIAH Structures or groups of NIAH structures of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity will front directly onto the Proposed Scheme. These include 75 and 77 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH 50081052), 72 and 74 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH 50081059), 66 to 70 Harold's Cross Road (NIAH 50081060, even numbers only), 65 and 66 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080943), and Leonard's Corner Post Office, 68 Clanbrassil Street Upper (NIAH 50080945). None of these features will be directly impacted by the Proposed Scheme, but there is the potential for damage during construction. The magnitude of impact is Medium. The potential

Construction Phase impact on the identified NIAH structures will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Temporary.

#### Street Furniture

- 9.158. A total of seven cast iron post boxes were identified in the study area of the Proposed Scheme, two of which are included in the NIAH. All but one of the identified post boxes are of the freestanding pillar type. The remaining post box is inset into a wall. They are listed in Table 16.13 of the EIAR and described in more detail in Appendix A16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites in Volume 4 of the EIAR.
- 9.159. A total of 44 lamp posts or groups of lamp posts were identified as having architectural heritage significance. A full list of the identified lamp posts is included in Table 16.14 of the EIAR and these are described in more detail in Appendix A16.2 Inventory of Architectural Heritage Sites in Volume 4 of the EIAR. The identified lamp posts are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity.
- 9.160. Proposed mitigation measures for architectural heritage features are outlined in this Section and detailed in Appendix A16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of the EIAR.
- 9.161. The proposed mitigation is the recording of the existing boundaries in position prior to the works, labelling the affected masonry, brickwork, railings, gates, gate posts, capping stones prior to their careful removal to safe storage, and their reinstatement on new lines, which reinstate the existing details, and the relationships between the entrances and the historic buildings. Recording is to be undertaken by an appropriate architectural heritage specialist engaged by the appointed contractor. The architectural heritage specialist will oversee the labelling, taking-down and reinstatement of the affected gates, railings, piers, bricks and masonry. Works to historic fabric will be carried out in accordance with the methodology provided in Appendix A16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of this EIAR.
- 9.162. The Conservation Section of DCC notes that:



- In order to safeguard the special architectural interest of affected Architectural Heritage across the Bus Connects routes - including Protected Structures and Conservation Areas, landscaping, historic paving, setts, kerbing and associated features, boundary treatments, historic street furniture, gardens and trees and historic public realm etc. - and to ensure that the proposed works will be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice with no unauthorised or unnecessary damage or loss of historic fabric, the Conservation Section recommend that all works shall be designed and supervised by an expert in architectural conservation in accordance with the provisions (outlined above) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and relevant documents of the DHLGH Advice Series.
- All works shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice, the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and the Advice Series issued by the Department of the Housing, Local Government and Heritage. All repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ. Items to be removed for repair off-site shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement.

9.163. The Conservation Section also recommends the following specific measures:

- A redesigned scheme at Robert Emmet Bridge that is of higher architectural quality than the submitted proposal and that would lessen the physical and visual impact on the historic masonry bridge.
- The concealment/ burial of historic walls at Clanbrassil Street Upper is not appropriate.
- Request full details of the design and type and location of each bus shelter/ stop along the proposed route in front of Protected

Structures and structures on the NIAH.

- The Conservation Section recommends the omission of bus shelters in front of and in the immediate vicinity of Protected Structures across the route and for bus stops only to be considered at these locations, in order to minimise visual clutter and protect the special architectural character of Protected Structures.
- Consideration should be given to the rationalisation of all traffic infrastructure such as signage, traffic poles, utility boxes etc.
- The Conservation Section recommends the omission of cantilevered signal poles in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within Conservation Areas, red hatched conservation areas and residential conservation areas and alternative traffic signalling solutions should be sought
- Consideration should be given to the omission of gantry traffic signage in the vicinity of Protected Structures, within Architectural Conservation Areas, red hatched conservation areas and residential conservation areas and alternative traffic signage solutions should be sought.
- Where cycle ways are located in close proximity to Protected Structures and within Conservation Areas generally, the Conservation Section recommends the use of alternative high quality cycle lane surface in-lieu of red tarmacadam.
- The alignment of footpaths should respect the setting of Protected Structures and buildings of National importance.

#### Mitigation

- 9.164. An experienced and competent licence-eligible archaeologist will be employed by the appointed contractor to advise on archaeological and cultural heritage matters during construction, to communicate all findings in a timely manner to the NTA and statutory authorities, to acquire any licenses/ consents required to conduct the work,

and to supervise and direct the archaeological measures associated with the Proposed Scheme.

- 9.165. Licence applications are made by the licence-eligible archaeologist to the National Monuments Service at the DHLGH. In addition to a detailed method statement, the applications must include a letter from the NTA that confirms the availability of adequate funding. There is a prescribed format for the letter that must be followed.
- 9.166. Other consents may include a Detection Device licence to use a metal-detector or to carry out a non-invasive geophysical survey.
- 9.167. A construction schedule will be made available to the archaeologist, with information on where and when the various elements and ground disturbance will take place.
- 9.168. As part of the licensing requirements, it is essential for the client to provide sufficient notice to the archaeologist(s) in advance of the construction works commencing. This will allow for prompt arrival on site to undertake additional surveys and to monitor ground disturbances. As often happens, there may down time where no excavation work is taking place during the construction phase. In this case, it will be necessary to inform the archaeologist/s as to when ground-breaking works will recommence.
- 9.169. In the event of archaeological features or material being uncovered during the Construction Phase, all machine work will cease in the immediate area to allow the archaeologist/s time to inspect and record any such material.
- 9.170. Once the presence of archaeologically significant material is established, full archaeological recording of such material is recommended. If it is not possible for the construction works to avoid the material, full excavation will be recommended. The extent and duration of excavation will be advised by the client's archaeologist and will be a matter for discussion between the NTA and the licensing authorities.
- 9.171. Secure storage for artefacts recovered during the course of the monitoring and related work will be provided by the appointed contractor.

- 9.172. As part of the licensing requirement and in accordance with the funding letter, adequate funds to cover excavation, post-excavation analysis, and any testing or conservation work required will be made available.
- 9.173. During the construction all machine traffic must be restricted as to avoid any newly revealed archaeological or cultural heritage sites and their environs. Materials management will be in operation to ensure no damage to a site of archaeological interest
- 9.174. Archaeological monitoring (as defined in section 15.3.5.1) under licence will take place, where any preparatory ground-breaking or ground reduction works are required at the following locations:
- Within the designated ZAP for the Historic Dublin City Watercourse (RMP DU022-003001/002 and RMP DU018-043004), which includes the recorded millrace site (RMP DU022-003002) and mill and mill pond (RMP DU022-077001/002) and
  - At Mount Argus Way, the site of a weir (RMP DU018-043003), known locally as the 'Tongue' or the 'Stone Boat'. The design intent is to avoid any impact to the weir (RMP DU018- 043003). As a mitigation measure, all piling arisings and any ground breaking works will be archaeologically monitored in order to identify any associated below ground archaeological features or finds.
  - On Harold's Cross Road where the former line of a tramway has been identified (DCIHR 18-15- 030);
  - At Robert Emmet Bridge (or Harold's Cross Bridge) (NIAH 50080983 and DCHIR 18-15-009) and the Grand Canal where excavation will occur to accommodate the new design proposals. Excavation in the area may result in revealing features of an industrial heritage interest associated with the canal and bridge. Any ground-breaking works at this location may result in a Negative, Moderate, Permanent impact on industrial heritage remains, which survive below ground. Any resultant archaeological or industrial heritage features will be identified and recorded; and

- The setting and the configuration of the canal, bridge and streetscape will be altered as the bridge will be widened via standalone structures to the east and west of the existing structure to accommodate the additional space needed for the Proposed Scheme.
- Archaeological monitoring will take place at the early stages of construction, where any preparatory ground-breaking or ground reduction works are required (as defined in Section 15.4.1) at Construction Compounds K1 and K2. This will be undertaken in order to establish the presence or absence, as well as the nature and extent, of any archaeological deposits, features or sites that may be present in these areas. At K3 no excavation works are envisaged.

9.175. Coal Hole covers will be recorded by an archaeologist in relation to the associated property and coal cellar. The surrounding granite setting will be recorded, noting the presence and characteristics of any channel which has been carved into the setting. The coal hole covers and associated granite settings will be removed under archaeological supervision and in accordance with a method statement agreed with the NTA and the statutory authorities. They will be reinstated as close as possible to their original location to accommodate a cycling track.

9.175.1. Works to lamp posts, paving and surface treatments will also be overseen by an architectural specialist and will also be carried out by the appointed contractor in accordance with the methodology provided in Appendix A.16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

#### Potential Operation Phase Impacts

9.176. A summary of Predicted Construction Phase Impacts Following the Implementation of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures are set out in Table 16.17 of the EIAR. In the main the predicated residual impact is considered Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Temporary.

9.177. The characteristics of the Proposed Scheme of particular relevance to the architectural heritage assessment during the Operational Phase, are the alterations to bus stop locations, particularly where these include the erection of new shelters or

cantilever signal poles or the removal of existing shelters, and alterations to the public realm including the provision of new trees, and the removal of trees which may impact on the settings of sensitive features and sites. The proposed improvements to the public realm, and the resulting reduction in vehicular traffic will generally have a positive effect on the historic environment

9.178. Whilst no negative impacts of significance are expected as a result of the development, I note the repositioning of the rusticated granite north pier and part of the curtain wall to the entrance gates to Our Lady's Hospice, Greenmount House, Harold's Cross Road (DCC RPS 3581, NIAH 50081061) will permanently alter the symmetry of the entrance gates. The gate piers and curtain wall are protected structures of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity, as they are part of the curtilage of the Hospice. The pre-mitigation Operational Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Long-Term. Mitigation will include the reinstatement of both the pier and the curtain wall on the proposed new alignment under the supervision of an appropriate architectural heritage specialist engaged by the appointed contractor, and as outlined in Appendix A16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of the EIAR. The reinstatement of historic fabric will retain much of the character and symmetry of the entrance gates, which will reduce the magnitude of the impact from Medium to Low. The predicted residual Operational Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Slight and Long-Term.

9.179. Two new cycle / pedestrian bridges will run parallel to Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) which is within the Grand Canal Conservation Area. The new bridges will be independently supported and will be of a contemporary design. There will be a visual impact on the vistas of the Grand Canal Conservation Area and Robert Emmet Bridge from the Grand Canal, the R137 on Harold's Cross Road and Clanbrassil Street Upper, in that the bridge and road will be wider. The pre-mitigation Operational Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Long-Term. Mitigation will include the retention of part of the end walls to the bridge where they directly adjoin the 1930s bridge, and the reuse of the remaining fabric of the end walls in place of the existing galvanised railings to the east and west of the proposed cycle / pedestrian bridges,

under the supervision of an appropriate architectural heritage specialist engaged by the appointed contractor.

- 9.180. The road widening to accommodate the northbound bus corridor, a cycle track and footpath on R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper will result in the cut limestone retaining walls (NIAH 50080982) on the west side of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper being repositioned. The walls form part of a group of structures with Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and the Grand Canal (CBC0011BTH042). The retaining walls are partly located within the Grand Canal Conservation Area and are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. They also form part of the character of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper. Though the fabric of the walls will have been retained beneath the widened road or reinstated on the proposed new alignment, the character of the street will be visibly wider in the Operational Phase. The pre-mitigation Operational Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Significant and LongTerm. Mitigation will include the reuse of masonry and coping of the removed walls in the rebuilt parapet walls under the supervision of an appropriate architectural heritage specialist engaged by the appointed contractor, and as outlined in Appendix A16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of the EIAR, so that they will be in keeping with the existing walls on the east side of the road.
- 9.181. A new bus shelter will be located directly in front of numbers 184 and 186 Kimmage Road Lower, which form part of a 1930s red brick terrace from 178 to 220 Kimmage Road Lower (CBC0011BTH024). The houses are of Regional Importance and Medium Sensitivity. The pre-mitigation Operational Phase impact will be Indirect, Negative, Moderate and Long-Term. The houses are raised above the level of the road which ensures that the shelter will not obscure the view from the houses.
- 9.182. The applicant proposes to record the existing boundaries in position prior to the commencement of construction works. All affected railings, gates, gate posts, capping stones and historic masonry are to be labelled prior to their careful removal to safe storage, and their reinstatement on new lines, reinstating the existing details, and the relationships between the entrances and the historic buildings. Recording is to be

undertaken by an appropriate architectural heritage specialist engaged by the appointed contractor.

9.183. A similar approach is to be undertaken in relation to other Structures of Architectural Heritage Interest as listed above.

9.184. Such measures are commonplace in relation to works within the curtilage of a protected structure or historical building or street furniture. The specific features will not be damaged or removed but merely relocated. It is reasonable therefore to consider the magnitude of effects not to be significant in this instance.

9.185. I draw the Board's attention to table 14 hereunder in which all of the potential impacts, and the magnitude of same are summarised for ease of reference.

9.186. Significant impacts do not arise in relation to the operation of the development.

#### Conclusion

9.187. Once the mitigation measures have been implemented, there will be no Significant residual Negative impacts on architectural heritage as a result of the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme.

9.188. I note the Council's concerns in relation to proposed bridges on the character of Robert Emmet Bridge (NIAH 50080983) and the Conservation Area and repositioning of retaining walls and steps (NIAH 50080982), at Clanbrassil Street Upper on the Character of the Conservation Area. The works at this constrained location are necessary to implement the proposed scheme. In the interest of retaining the integrity of these structures I recommend that an Architectural Heritage Specialist is employed to monitor any impact upon, the removal and replacement of such structures.

9.188.1. Overall general impacts to architectural heritage arise in relation to the alterations to the public realm including the provision of new trees, and the removal of trees which may impact on the settings of sensitive features and sites. The proposed development will improve the overall streetscape along the proposed route and whilst I acknowledge that the removal of trees at specific locations may impact the setting or character of a particular structure, I am satisfied that on balance the overall scheme will be a vast improvement to the character and setting of not only



protected structures referred to above but to buildings which, although not protected, provide a historical reference to the past.

9.189. I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural heritage and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts on Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural heritage can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural heritage can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site including the proposed the other bus connects routes are not likely to arise.

*Table 14 Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Architectural heritage – Summary of potential and residual effects.*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
<p><b><u>Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Road to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road</u></b></p> <p><b>Works to:</b></p> <p><b>RMP DU018-043003-Tongue/Stone Boat, Mount Argus Way</b></p>	Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary	Yes.  Mitigation will include recording, protection and monitoring of the sensitive fabric by an appropriate architectural heritage specialist engaged by the appointed contractor,	Indirect, Negative, Slight Temporary

		prior to and for the duration of the Construction Phase, in accordance with the methodology provided in Appendix A16.3 Methodology for Works Affecting Sensitive and Historic Fabric in Volume 4 of the EIAR,	
<u><b>Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal</b></u>  <b>Works including:</b>  <b>RMP DU018-050 Public Park, Village Green, Harold's Cross Road</b>  <b>NIAH 50081060 66 Harold's Cross Road</b>  <b>DCC RPS 3581 Entrance gates of Our Lady's Hospice, Harold's Cross Road</b>  <b>DCC RPS 3581 Construction Compound K2 in the grounds of Our Lady's Hospice, Harold's Cross Road</b>	Indirect, Negative, Moderate Temporary / Direct, Negative, Moderate Temporary / Direct, Negative, Slight Temporary	As Above	Indirect, Negative, Not Significant Temporary / Direct, Negative, Slight, Temporary / Indirect Negative, Not significant, Temporary / Direct, Negative, Not Significant Temporary / Direct, Negative, Slight Long-Term

<b>CBC0011BTH040 33 to 61 Harold's Cross Road</b>  <b>CBC0011BTH167, CBC0011BTH135, CBC0011BTH136 Kerbs in the Grand Canal Conservation Area</b>  <b>The Grand Canal Conservation Area</b>			
<u><b>Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction</b></u>  <b>Works including:</b>  <b>The Grand Canal Conservation Area Proposed new bridges at the Robert Emmet Bridge</b>  <b>NIAH 50080983 Robert Emmet Bridge</b>  <b>The Grand Canal Conservation Area</b>  <b>Repositioning of the limestone retaining walls on Clanbrassil Street</b>  <b>NIAH 50080982 Limestone retaining walls and steps, Clanbrassil Street Upper</b>  <b>Patrick Street Conservation Area</b>	Direct, Negative, Moderate Long-Term / Direct, Negative, Significant Long-Term / Indirect, Negative, Significant Temporary	As above	Direct, Negative, Slight Long-Term / Direct, Negative, Moderate Long- Term / Indirect, Negative, Not Significant Temporary
<b>Protected Structures (all Sections) Refer to Appendix</b>	Indirect, Negative,	As above	Indirect, Negative, Not Significant, Temporary

<b>A16.7 in Volume 4 of this EIAR for feature identification</b>	Moderate Temporary		
<b>Protected Structures (100 locations)</b>			
<b>NIAH Structures (all Sections) Refer to Table: 16.10 of the EIAR for feature identification</b>	Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary	As above	Indirect, Negative, Not Significant, Temporary
<b>Other Structures of Built Heritage Interest (all Sections) Refer to Appendix A16.2 for feature identification</b>	Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary	As above	Indirect, Negative, Not Significant, Temporary.
<b>Post boxes (all Sections) Refer to Table: 16.14 for feature identification</b> <b>Post boxes (7 locations)</b>	Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary	As above	Indirect, Negative, Not significant, Temporary
<b>Lamp Posts (all Sections) Refer to Table: 16.14 of the EIAR for feature identification</b>	Direct, Negative, Significant Temporary / Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary	As above	Direct, Negative, Slight Temporary / Indirect, Negative, Not Significant Temporary
<b>Statuary and street furniture (all Sections) Refer to Table: 16.15 of the EIAR for feature identification</b>	Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary		Indirect, Negative, Slight, Temporary

<b>Statuary and street furniture (6 locations)</b>			
<b>Paving and Surface Treatments (all Sections) Refer to Table 16.16 for feature identification</b>	Direct, Negative, Significant Temporary / Indirect, Negative, Moderate, Temporary	As above	Direct, Negative, Slight Long-Term/ Indirect, Negative, Slight Temporary.

### **Landscape, Townscape & Visual**

9.190. Section 17 of the EIAR submitted examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to landscape, townscape and visual impact. It is of note that visual impacts in relation to the proposed scheme have been examined in the context of the project design and the public realm within the assessment section of this report. See section 6.16 of this report. Such matters will not be repeated hereunder and this section of the EIAR should be read in conjunction with the aforementioned. It is important to mention at the outset that likely significant adverse effects will arise but are short term and temporary in nature, with the exception of the permanent acquisition of property which have mature gardens and plantings with established boundaries. All other impacts are considered to be of moderate magnitude.

#### **Baseline Conditions**

9.191. The establishment of baseline conditions was carried out based on initial desk studies, supported by full route walkovers and augmented by further specific site reviews. The Proposed Scheme includes a wide variety of suburban and inner-city suburban residential landscapes, townscape and visual features from streetscape boundary and public realm features, to residential and mixed use zonings, historic landscapes and boundaries, to biodiversity and heritage assets, see section 5.24 of this report above for zoning designations, for Dublin City Council pertaining to the proposed scheme.

9.192. For the purpose of the visual & townscape assessment the proposed route has been divided into four sections as follows:

- Section 1 - Lower Kimmage Road from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road
- Section 2 - Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal and
- Section 3 - Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction

Baseline conditions for each of the above sections is outlined in table 17.6 of the EIAR. In brief I note that with regard to the first section above, the area is described as outer predominantly two-storey residential suburb, with traditional urban village, with one and two-storey properties at Harold's Cross. The streetscape character is a suburban road, predominantly lined by two-storey terraces, most of redbrick or redbrick and render with established front gardens – some with driveways. Key townscape features include a traditional road corridor through residential suburbs. Small sections of local services with outer city village and small city park at Harold's Cross. Established areas of open space with mature trees. Large city cemetery with protected structures / features. Amenity designations include: Poddle Park, Mount Argus Park, Harold's Cross Park, Mount Jerome Cemetery. There are no ACAs, Conservation Areas, tree preservation orders or protected views. There are protected structures present along this section of the route and the impact to same has been examined within the relevant section of this report above and will not be repeated hereunder save to state that such structures are present within this section of the scheme.

9.193. In relation to the second section identified above; Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal, I note that this section of the proposed route currently comprises a major road corridor, which is a historic city access route. The streetscape character comprises a mix of traditional brick and render properties – some with small front gardens – enclosed with railings near Harold's Cross Park and modern mixed construction infill. Some terraces / properties to the east are elevated over the road corridor with stepped accesses. There is also a mix of local services, residential and

office uses. Key Townscape Features include: The Grand Canal Corridor, city village and public park at Poddle Park, Kimmage. Amenity designations include the Grand Canal open space and conservation area. There are no tree preservation orders or protected views. There are no protected structures of relevance present along this section of the route.

9.194. In relation to the third section - Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction. I note that this section of the proposed route currently comprises a major city carriageway road and historic city access route, which transitions to wide city centre dual carriageway along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / New Street South approaching St. Patrick's Cathedral area. Key Townscape Features include: some original residential terraces with gardens and railings to the south. There is a protected (key) view and prospect north along the R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / New Street South towards St. Patrick's Cathedral. There are three amenity designations, on the island in R137 New Street South / R110 Kevin Street Upper Junction. The conservation area at the corner of R137 New Street South / R110 Kevin Street Upper. And the Residential Conservation Areas along R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and at Malpas Street. There are no tree preservation orders. There are protected structures present along this section of the route and the impact to same has been examined within the relevant section of this report above and will not be repeated hereunder save to state that such structures are present within this section of the scheme.

#### Potential Impacts

9.195. The potential for impacts to arise relate to both the construction and operational phase of the development. The applicant within section 17.4.1.3 of the EIAR has listed the key characteristics of the proposed construction phase which are of particular relevance to the townscape and visual assessment. Such characteristics relate to proposed works at specific locations such as the provision of new junction layouts, lighting, drainage, road markings and surfaces, land take for the widening of surfaces, removal of trees and landscaping and removal of residential boundaries and garden landscaping. Substantial works will take place at Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand

Canal, including changes to footpaths and construction of a new cycle / pedestrian bridge, two trees will be removed. Substantial works will comprise road widening with a new masonry faced retaining wall at No.29 to 32 Clanbrassil Street Upper and revised ramped access lane to Gordon's Fuels at No.32a on the north side of the Grand Canal, west of Robert Emmet Bridge. At Our Lady's Hospice, Harold's Cross: construction of a permanent carpark, with loss of one existing tree. Land take of a portion of private gardens with established boundary walls, pedestrian entrance gates and stepped accesses, some with mature plantings for road widening at No. 33 to 61 on the east side of Harold's Cross Road. Four street trees will be removed at this section. The fore mentioned will be the most dominant changes to the landscape and street scape during the construction phase of the development.

9.196. It is also important to note that the applicant has provided photomontages of the scheme which I have had regard to in the assessment of effects to landscape, townscape and the visual aspects of the proposed development. These demonstrate that the overriding visual changes to the proposed route relate to the loss of trees and vegetation and the replacement of same with species at a smaller growth stage.

9.197. In the interest of conciseness, I will examine the potential impacts relevant to each of the three sections of the scheme individually hereunder. However certain construction activities are common to all sections and will have a certain level of impact visually. The presence of construction machinery, fencing and hoardings and general construction activities associated with the diversion of services and widening and resurfacing of road space will all have a visual impact albeit temporarily. Such activities cannot be mitigated and are not considered to be significant given the temporary nature of the works.

Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road

9.198. The baseline townscape is of **high sensitivity** and the construction of the Proposed Scheme will involve limited demolition, excavation, resurfacing and construction works along sections of kerbs, road carriageways, new road median, sections of footpaths, junctions, surfacing and parking, drainage features and utilities along the



principal corridor of R137 Kimmage Road Lower. Construction Compound K1 will be located at an existing carpark off Sundrive Road. The Proposed Scheme will include for the construction of a section of cycle / footpath and boardwalk along the River Poddle corridor at 'The Stone Boat' feature between Sundrive Road and Mount Argus Way. Construction works will also provide for minor traffic management at the junction of Ravensdale Park and Poddle Park for the quiet street cycle route along Poddle Park, Blarney Park, Sundrive Road, Mount Argus Square, Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View. The Proposed Scheme will include modifications to three existing junctions along Derravaragh Road at Corrib Road, Neagh Road and Mount Tallant Avenue reducing vehicle movements whilst constructing cycle gates. Works are also proposed to the junction between Kenilworth Park / Harold's Cross Road / Kenilworth Square North / Rathgar Avenue including a bus gate off Kenilworth Park East. The construction works along R817 Kimmage Road Lower and related traffic management works will result in minor alterations to elements of the existing streetscape. The construction works will not alter the overall townscape character along this section of the Proposed Scheme, but the presence of construction activity will have an impact on streetscape. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is medium. The potential townscape / streetscape effect of the Construction Phase is assessed to be **Negative, Moderate / Significant and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal

**9.199.** The baseline townscape is of **medium sensitivity** and construction of the Proposed Scheme will involve substantial changes along the existing major carriageway. The Construction Phase will involve demolition, excavation and construction works to kerbs, road carriageways, footpaths, junctions, surfacing, parking, drainage features, utilities and the removal of a small number of street trees. Construction works will also involve the acquisition of portions of private gardens, private buffer landscape areas, with removal of existing boundary walls and railings, loss of a portion of existing gardens with associated plantings, impacts on access arrangements etc.

Construction Compound K2 is to be located on the landscape area inside the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice, with loss of open space and one tree. The compound area will be overlooked by residential properties within the hospice grounds. There will be a permanent change due to the conversion of this area of open space to an area of car parking following decommissioning of Construction Compound K2. At the Grand Canal the Proposed Scheme will involve substantial works in the vicinity of Robert Emmet Bridge including changes to the existing carriageway over the bridge, construction of a new cycle / pedestrian bridge to the east and west of the bridge, removal of existing granite walls along R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and the re-alignment of canal towpaths to tie-in, with removal of four trees. The construction works will be extensive along the road corridor and will result in substantial alterations to elements of the existing streetscape, including at Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal. However, the construction works will not alter the existing townscape character along this section the Proposed Scheme but the presence of construction activity will have an impact on streetscape. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is very high. The potential townscape / streetscape effect of the Construction Phase is assessed to be **Negative, Significant and Temporary / Short-Term.**

Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction;

- 9.200. The baseline townscape is of **medium / high sensitivity** and the construction of the Proposed Scheme will involve changes across and along the majority of a part single / part dual carriageway urban road. The Construction Phase will involve mainly repairs to existing pavement, new segregated cycle tracks and revised road markings with minor construction / excavation work. Construction Compound K3, which will be small, is to be located on an existing part-grass / part-paved public space fronting St. Patrick's Court / Greenville Place along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower. The construction works will be wide-ranging along the road corridor and will result in substantial alterations to the existing streetscape character. The construction works will not alter the existing townscape character along this section

of the Proposed Scheme, but the presence of construction activity will be an impact on streetscape. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is medium. The potential townscape / streetscape effect of the Construction Phase is assessed to be **Negative, Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Architectural Conservations.

9.201. There are no ACAs along the Proposed Scheme.

#### Conservation Areas

**9.202.** Conservation Areas are located at the Grand Canal and the corner of R137 New Street South / R110 Kevin Street Upper. Sensitivity is assessed as very high. The construction of the Proposed Scheme will result in substantial changes and alterations to Robert Emmet Bridge over the Grand Canal and to the immediate canal banks and towpaths. The works will affect localised views to and from Robert Emmet Bridge and the Grand Canal. The works will not detract from views to and from the wider canal amenity. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is low overall but locally very high. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on the Grand Canal Conservation Area will be Negative, Moderate / Locally Significant and Temporary / Short-Term. The construction of the Proposed Scheme will result in minor changes to the road corridor in the vicinity of New Street South / Kevin Street Upper Conservation Area. The works will not affect key characteristics or features of the Conservation Area. The magnitude of change in the baseline environment is low. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on the New Street South / Kevin Street Upper Conservation Area is assessed to be **Negative, Slight and Temporary.**

**9.203.** Residential Conservation Areas, which are located along R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and Malpas Street, are of high sensitivity. The construction of the Proposed Scheme will not directly impact on the Residential Conservation Areas and works will be limited to the public road in these areas. The sensitivity is very high and the magnitude of change in the baseline environment is medium. The potential

townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on Residential Conservation Areas is assessed to be **Negative, Slight / Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Protected Structures

**9.204.** A number of protected structures are located along the Proposed Scheme corridor. These include Mount Jerome and associated structures and features, and property Nos. 7 to 20 and Nos. 50 to 55 Clanbrassil Street Upper, the corner of Fumbally Lane, and the granite base to the former public lavatories with the centrally located cast-iron ventilator (on an island at the R137 New Street South / R110 Kevin Street Junction). While located along the principal road corridor of the Proposed Scheme, there will be no direct effect on the properties or structures. The sensitivity is very high, and the magnitude of change is low. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on protected structures is assessed to be **Negative, Slight / Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Amenity Designations

**9.205.** A number of amenities (mainly open spaces, parks and the Grand Canal) are located along the Proposed Scheme corridor. These include areas of high sensitivity such as Poddle Park, the River Poddle corridor, Mount Argus Park, Harold's Cross Park and the Grand Canal corridor. The construction of the Proposed Scheme will include relatively minor works outside of Poddle Park, and along the River Poddle corridor at The Stone Boat feature. The works, which include construction of an elevated cycle / pedestrian boardwalk / path along the corridor of the River Poddle at Mount Argus Way, will have direct effects on the landscape and visual setting of the areas along a short section of the River Poddle at Mount Argus Way. The works on the main corridor will also impact on the setting of these amenity areas. The sensitivity is high, and the magnitude of change is low / medium. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on these amenities is assessed to be **Negative, Slight / Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

9.206. The construction of the Proposed Scheme will result in substantial changes and alterations to Robert Emmet Bridge over the amenity of the Grand Canal and to the immediate canal banks and towpaths. The works will detract from localised views to and from Robert Emmet Bridge and the Grand Canal and will impact directly on adjoining sections of the footpath / towpath. The works will not detract from views to and from the wider canal amenity. The sensitivity is high and the magnitude of change in the baseline amenity is low overall but locally high. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on the Grand Canal amenity is assessed to be **Negative, Slight / Locally Significant and Temporary / Short-Term.**

9.207. I note that while the construction of the Proposed Scheme will involve moderate works on the roads surrounding the highly sensitive Harold's Cross Park, they will not result in a direct impact in the characteristics or features of the park. Nevertheless, the works will be openly visible from the public park. The sensitivity is high, and the magnitude of change is medium. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on Harold's Cross Park is assessed to be **Negative, Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Preserved Views / Scenic Views

9.208. At the northern end of the Proposed Scheme at R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / New Street South towards St. Patrick's Cathedral. There will be construction works to the road corridor in the foreground of the view, and while the works will limit / disrupt the viewpoint, they will not impact on the sensitive characteristics of the view of St. Patrick's Cathedral. The sensitivity is very high, and the magnitude of change is low / medium. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on preserved views / scenic views is assessed to be **Negative, Slight / Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Properties

9.209. Construction of the Proposed Scheme will require land acquisition from **29 residential** properties: a shared forecourt at Nos. 14 to 26 on the western side of Harold's Cross

Road, Nos. 33 to 61 (odd numbers) on the eastern side of Harold's Cross Road, and No. 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper (residence adjacent to Gordon's Fuels). The houses (33 to 61) have mature established gardens with original boundary walls, entrance gates and stepped access paths. Construction works for widening of the road corridor will result in the removal of the existing boundaries including walls and entrance gates, portions of gardens, private property and associated plantings. The works will temporarily remove the railings and gravel area fronting Nos. 14 to 26 Harold's Cross Road. Access to properties will be retained. Construction works adjacent to and within these private and adjoining public areas will be openly visible from these properties. No 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper will be completely demolished to allow construction of the access ramp to Gordon's Fuels. The sensitivity is high, and the magnitude of change is very high. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on these properties is assessed to be **Negative, Very Significant and Temporary / Short-Term with the exception of No 32A which is Negative, Profound and Permanent.**

9.210. Construction of the Proposed Scheme will require the acquisition from several non-residential properties: car park at Sundrive Road (Construction Compound K1); Our Lady's Hospice (Construction Compound K2); Fottrell House Offices; Nos. 3 to 15 Harold's Cross Road, and at No.32a Clanbrassil Street Upper (Gordon's Fuels), and at No.31 Clanbrassil Street Upper (Mullen Scrap). While some areas are hard standing, works will involve removal of grass areas at Our Lady's Hospice and at Fottrell House Offices. The sensitivity is high, and the magnitude of change is medium / high. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on these properties is assessed to be **Negative, Significant / Very Significant and Temporary / Short-Term.**

9.211. In addition to those properties directly impacted through acquisition (temporary and / or permanent) of private areas, construction of the Proposed Scheme will also result in visual impacts for other residential and non-residential properties located along, fronting and viewing the Proposed Scheme. Impacts will arise from the provision of Construction Compounds, general disturbance, demolition, excavation and

construction works within the public road corridor of the Proposed Scheme. Construction works will be openly visible from these properties. The sensitivity is medium / high, and the magnitude of change is medium. The potential townscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on these properties is assessed to be **Negative, Moderate and Temporary / Short-Term.**

#### Trees and Vegetation

9.212. Construction of the Proposed Scheme will require the limited removal of existing trees and other plantings at specific locations along the road corridor. These include trees along Harold's Cross Road (seven street trees) plus a single tree in an open space adjacent to the entrance to Our Lady's Hospice. Four young trees will be removed from areas around Robert Emmet Bridge. Four street trees will be removed from Clanbrassil Street Upper / Lower and New Street South. The sensitivity is medium / high, and the magnitude of change is low. The potential townscape and visual effect of the Construction Phase on trees and plantings is assessed to be **Negative, Slight and Short-Term.**

9.213. Construction changes will occur over a period of 1 to 2 years and as such as mentioned above are for a short period of time. Impacts will therefore not be significant in the long term.

9.214. The operational phase of the development will result in impacts to many areas, with alterations in the road corridor and changes in traffic, pedestrian and cycle movements are features. It is not however anticipated these aspects in themselves will give rise to significant landscape, townscape or visual effects. Changes in road corridors, including in traffic signalisation, signage, and in carriageway allocation and traffic movements are a common and regular aspect of active road and traffic management for urban roads and streets. Therefore, such changes may also be considered as part and parcel of any urban streetscape environment.

9.215. I note that a number of trees will be removed during the Construction Phase. The Operational Phase of the Proposed Scheme will not impact directly on additional trees. The Operational Phase also provides for additional street planting, with quantities in

excess of those to be removed. The sensitivity is medium / high and the magnitude of change is low. The potential townscape / streetscape and visual effect of the Operational Phase on trees and plantings is assessed to be **Neutral, Slight and Short-Term becoming Positive, Slight / Moderate, Long-Term.**

9.216. Despite the adverse impacts on trees and properties there will be a substantial localised improvement in some areas of streetscape and the effect across the overall section will become positive over the long-term as proposed planting matures. The proposed development as mentioned above will result in many positive benefits to landscape and the streetscape through the provision of additional planting and improved surfaces and layouts of public circulation areas, pavements, cycle lanes and open spaces. The insertion of SUDs measures will soften the existing landscape and provide additional opportunities for biodiversity to thrive.

#### Mitigation

9.217. In order to reduce the magnitude of effects to landscape, streetscape and townscape it is proposed to protect vegetation that is to be retained during construction through the use of protective fencing. Where boundaries and vegetation are to be removed a record will be kept in order to replace the features with similar items. Where possible vegetation will be retained and replanted. All works will be carried out in accordance with a CEMP.

9.218. No mitigation or monitoring is proposed for the operational phase of the development.

#### Residual Impacts

9.219. Whilst mitigation will achieve a reduced impact and protect trees and vegetation to be retained, it will not eradicate the impacts listed above. The removal of mature trees cannot be mitigated and as such significant Construction Phase impacts at a local level remain unchanged in the post-mitigation and monitoring scenario. Operational phase impacts will improve with time as vegetation matures and will therefore not be significant. In conclusion therefore, significant long-term impacts to landscape and visual amenity do not arise in relation to the proposed development.



## Conclusion

- 9.220. Regard is had to photomontages prepared from key or illustrative viewpoints to give an indication of changes and potential effects resulting from the Proposed Scheme during the Operational Phase after the implementation of the scheme. The proposed views are shown with proposed planting at approximately 10 to 15 years post-completion of the Construction Phase. The Photomontages have been prepared in accordance with the methodology set out in Section 17.2.4.4 and are included in Figure A17.2 in Volume 3 of the EIAR.
- 9.221. In the Operational Phase negative moderate / significant residual effects will remain for residential properties on Harold's Cross Road experiencing permanent land acquisition. A profound permanent effect will remain for the single removed residential property on Clanbrassil Street Upper. The changes at Emmett Bridge will impact on views of the bridge but will also provide enhanced pedestrian and cycle access, resulting in a moderate neutral residual effect on the amenity of Grand Canal. There will be overall positive effects for all sections of the scheme, as the Proposed Scheme provides for improvements in the urban realm, most notably through an upgraded and consistent paving scheme and new street tree planting, which will result in positive long-term effects for the townscape and visual character. The Proposed Scheme will also provide for a significantly enhanced level of service for public transport and for pedestrian / cycle connectivity.
- 9.222. I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to Landscape, Streetscape and Visual and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential long term impacts on Landscape, Streetscape and Visual can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect long-term impacts on Landscape, Streetscape and Visual can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site including the proposed the other bus connects routes are not likely to arise.

Table 15 Landscape & Visual Summary of potential and residual effects.

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
<b>Construction phase Impacts</b>			
<b>Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road</b>	High	Protect trees to lessen effects.  Prepare an inventory of boundary details and accesses, planting, paving, and other features.  Maintain Access to properties and public open spaces.  Construction works will be managed by the preparation of a CEMP.	Negative Moderate / Significant Temporary / Short-Term
<b>Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal</b>	Medium	As Above	Negative Significant / Temporary / Short-Term
<b>Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.</b>	Medium / High	As Above	Negative Moderate Temporary / Short-Term
<b>Operational Phase Impacts</b>			
<b>Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road.</b>	High	None	Positive / Slight / Moderate Short-Term
<b>Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal.</b>	Medium	None	Neutral, Moderate, Short-Term
<b>Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the</b>	Medium / High	None	Positive Slight Short-Term

Patrick Street Junction.			
--------------------------	--	--	--

## Roads and Traffic

9.223. Section 6 of the EIAR examines the impact of the proposed scheme on traffic. For the purpose of assessment, the proposed route has been considered under three sections:

- Section 1 - R817 Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Cross Roads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road.
- Section 2 - R137 Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal.
- Section 3 - R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.

### Baseline Conditions

9.224. Overall cycling infrastructure provision on the corridor consists of 76% cycle priority outbound (0% cycle track, 76% non-segregated), with 86% inbound (0% segregated, 86% non-segregated).

9.225. Bus services along the Proposed Scheme currently operate within a constrained and congested environment. The Proposed Scheme is expected to deliver savings in bus journey time in both the AM and PM peaks. The most notable savings can be seen in the PM peak on the Clanbrassil Street Lower approach to the South Circular Road Junction (Leonard's Corner) and the Clanbrassil Street Upper approach to Windsor Terrace (Grand Canal). In both cases, the introduction of bus lanes up to the junction stop line can be seen to offer journey time and reliability savings versus the Do Minimum.

9.226. The following section of this report will outline the base line conditions in relation to the relevant sections mentioned above.

Section 1 - R817 Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Crossroads to the Junction with Harold's Cross Road.

- 9.227. This section commences runs from the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / R818 Terenure Road West / R817 Fortfield Road / R818 Kimmage Road West junction to the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / R137 Harold's Cross Road junction at the northern end of Harold's Cross Park. Section 1 is approximately 2.2km long and consists mainly of R817 Kimmage Road Lower, along with the Harold's Cross Road carriageways (R137) on the eastern side of Harold's Cross Park.
- 9.228. A secondary cycle route will also be designated, in parallel to R817 Kimmage Road Lower, along Poddle Park, Bangor Road, and Blarney Park to Sundrive Road. From Sundrive Road, cyclists will be able to proceed via a new connection to Mount Argus Way and Mount Argus View where a proposed steel boardwalk structure will be provided beside the River Poddle at the Stone Boat feature.
- 9.229. The walking facilities along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme include reasonably wide, well-lit footpaths on both sides of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower as far as the southern end of Harold's Cross Park. Alongside Harold's Cross Park, there is a wide footpath on the western side of R817 Kimmage Road Lower, and a narrow path (<1.5m) on the eastern side adjoining the park. R137 Harold's Cross Road (adjacent to Harold's Cross Park) only includes a footpath along the western side of the carriageway. The footpaths vary in width and on occasion drops below the minimum width of 1.8m, creating a pinch point.
- 9.230. There are several controlled pedestrian crossings along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme which benefit from tactile paving and dropped kerbs. Uncontrolled crossings across priority junctions at side roads also benefit from dropped kerbs. Further details of the baseline pedestrian facilities (i.e. routing, directness, accessibility, crossing and footpath widths) at each junction along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme is included in Appendix A6.4 – Appendix A6.4.1 (Pedestrian Infrastructure Assessment)) in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

9.231. The cycle facilities along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme consist of advisory cycle lanes (typical width of 1.5m) in both directions along R817 Kimmage Road Lower, and a mixture of advisory cycle lanes (typical width of 1.5m) and combined bus and cycle lanes along R817 Harold's Cross Road and R137 Harold's Cross Road, either side of Harold's Cross Park. There are no existing cycle facilities along the proposed quiet cycle route of Poddle Park, Bangor Road, Blarney Park, Sundrive Road, Mount Argus Square, Mount Argus Way, Mount Argus Avenue and Mount Argus View.

9.232. Cycle parking is provided at the following locations along and within the vicinity of Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme:

- Two Sheffield stands along R817 Kimmage Road Lower outside shops to the north of Corrib Road.
- Five Sheffield stands along Sundrive Road next to the junction with R817 Kimmage Road Lower.
- Five Sheffield stands along R817 Kimmage Road Lower outside the entrance to the Mount Argus Catholic Church.
- Three Sheffield stands along R317 Harold's Cross Road to the south of the entrance to Harold's Cross Educate Together Secondary School; and
- Further cycle parking at Sundrive Road Shopping Centre and within Harold's Cross Park.

9.233. There are limited bus lanes along Section 1. At the northern end of the section a northbound combined bus and cycle lane commences to the north of the R137 Kimmage Road Lower / St Clare's Avenue junction and extends through R137 Harold's Cross Road Junction. There are no bus lanes at the R137 Harold's Cross Road / Kenilworth Park Junction, although there is a northbound bus lane on the southern approach that terminates 70m in advance of the stop line. The northbound bus lane recommences 20m north of the junction, with a tapered entry that extends back to the junction.

9.234. There are currently 16 bus stops along Section 1 of the Proposed Route (seven inbound stops on R137 Harold's Cross Road towards the City Centre, seven outbound stops on R137 Harold's Cross Road and two orbital stops located on Sundrive Road).

9.235. The R817 Kimmage Road Lower is a two-way carriageway, with a speed limit of 50km/h. For much of the length, R817 Kimmage Road Lower has one lane in each direction except for turning lanes at junctions. The carriageway varies in width from approximately 16m (in the vicinity of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Fortfield Road / R818 Terenure Road West Road Junction where there are two lanes and hatching) to approximately 5.5m (north of Kimmage Court). Generally, the carriageway is approximately 7.5m in width where there are only single lanes in each direction. Most junctions along R817 Kimmage Road Lower are minor priority junctions providing access to residential streets and commercial properties. The priority junctions provide signage and road markings such as broken white lines and, in some instances, yellow box markings to ensure vehicles can enter and exit the minor arms easily. The existing major junction arrangements along the section are as follows:

- R817 Kimmage Road Lower, Fortfield Road and R818 Terenure Road West Road;
- R817 Kimmage Road Lower and Ravensdale Park;
- R817 Kimmage Road Lower, Sundrive Road and Larkfield Avenue;
- R817 Kimmage Road Lower and Mount Argus View; and
- R817 Kimmage Road Lower and R137 Harold's Cross Road.

9.236. Along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme there is a total of 760 existing parking / loading spaces. Of the existing parking spaces, 437 spaces are located along the Proposed Scheme corridor and the remaining 323 spaces are located along side roads within approximately 250m of the Proposed Scheme.

## Section 2 – R137 Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal

- 9.237. This Section of the Proposed Scheme from Harold's Cross Park to the Grand Canal is approximately 400m long and consists of R137 Harold's Cross Road between the R137 Harold's Cross Road / R817 Harold's Cross Road junction and the R137 Harold's Cross Road / R111 Parnell Road / R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper / R111 Grove Road Junction.
- 9.238. The walking facilities along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme include reasonably wide, well-lit footpaths on both sides of the R137 Harold's Cross Road carriageway between Harold's Cross Park and the Grand Canal. There are several controlled pedestrian crossings along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme which benefit from tactile paving and dropped kerbs. Uncontrolled crossings across priority junctions at side roads also benefit from dropped kerbs.
- 9.239. The cycle facilities along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme consist of a mix of advisory cycle lanes (typical width of 1.5m) and combined bus and cycle lanes in both directions that operate between 07.00hrs to 10.00hrs and 12.00hrs to 19.00hrs from Monday to Saturday.
- 9.240. Cycle parking is provided at the following locations along and within the vicinity of Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme:
- Five Sheffield stands along R137 Harold's Cross Road to the south of St Clare's Convent National School; and
  - Three Sheffield stands along R137 Harold's Cross Road to the south of Greenmount Avenue.
- 9.241. Along Section 2, the northbound and southbound combined bus and cycle lanes are in operation between 07:00hrs and 10:00hrs and 12:00hrs and 19:00hrs, Monday to Saturday.
- 9.242. There are currently three bus stops along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme (two 'inbound' stops towards the city centre and one 'outbound' stop).

- 9.243. The R137 Harold's Cross Road in Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme is a two-way carriageway, with a speed limit of 50km/h. For much of the length, R137 Harold's Cross Road has a single traffic lane and bus lane in each direction. The carriageway width varies from approximately 5.5m to approximately 13m where two lanes in each direction are available. Most junctions along R137 Harold's Cross Road are minor priority junctions providing access to residential street and commercial properties. The priority junctions provide signage and road markings such as broken white lines and, in some instances, yellow box markings to ensure vehicles travelling are able to turn in and out of the minor arms. The existing major junction arrangement along Section 2 comprises the R137 Harold's Cross Road / R111 Grove Road / R111 Parnell Road.
- 9.244. Along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme there are a total of 78 existing parking / loading spaces. Of the existing parking spaces, 19 spaces are located along the Proposed Scheme corridor and the remaining 59 spaces are located along side roads within approximately 250m of the scheme.

Section 3 – R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and R137 New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction.

- 9.245. Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme consists of approximately 290m of R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper, 500m of R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower and 300m of R137 New Street South.
- 9.246. The walking facilities along Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme include reasonably wide, well-lit footpaths on both sides of the R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower, R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper and R137 New Street South between Grand Canal and R110 Kevin Street Upper.
- 9.247. There are several controlled pedestrian crossings along Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme which benefit from tactile paving and dropped kerbs. Uncontrolled crossings across priority junctions at side roads also benefit from dropped kerbs. The locations of the pedestrian crossings are illustrated in Figure 6.3a in Volume 3 of the EIAR.
- 9.248. The cycle facilities along Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme consists of a mixture of advisory cycle lanes (typical width of 1.5m) and combined bus and cycle lanes along



R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper, R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower and R137 New Street South. The northbound cycle infrastructure operates between 07.00hrs to 10.00hrs and 12.00hrs to 19.00hrs from Monday to Saturday, however, there are no limits on the operational hours for the southbound lanes.

9.249. Cycle parking is provided at the following locations along and within the vicinity of Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme:

- Four Sheffield stands along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower to the north of the junction with R811 South Circular Road;
- Five Sheffield stands along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower immediately south of Donovan Lane;
- Eight Sheffield stands along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower to the north of Donovan Lane;
- Four Sheffield stands along R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower immediately south of Malpas Street;
- Five Sheffield stands along R137 New Street South immediately south of Fumbally Lane;
- Nine Sheffield stands along R137 New Street South immediately north of Fumbally Lane;
- Ten Sheffield stands along R137 New Street South opposite Cathedral View Court;
- Four Sheffield stands along R137 New Street South immediately south of the R110 Kevin Street Upper slip road;
- Five Sheffield stands along R137 Patrick Street at the R137 Patrick Street / R110 Kevin Street Upper / R137 New Street South / R110 The Coombe Junction; and

- Fourteen Sheffield stands along R110 The Coombe at the R137 Patrick Street / R110 Kevin Street Upper / R137 New Street South / R110 The Coombe Junction.

9.250. A northbound combined bus and cycle lane is provided for approximately 80m from north of Robert Emmet Bridge to the R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper / Wesley Place Junction. Between the R137 Clanbrassil Street Upper / Wesley Place Junction and the R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / Lombard Street West Junction, there is no bus priority provision. At the R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / Lombard Street West Junction, a northbound combined bus and cycle lane commences for approximately 500m to approximately 30m north of the R137 New Street South / Cathedral View Court Junction. The bus lanes are in operation between 07:00hrs and 10:00hrs and 12:00hrs and 19:00hrs, Monday to Saturday. Outside of operational hours the lanes can be used by all traffic.

9.251. No southbound bus lanes are provided along Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme.

9.252. There are currently nine bus stops along Section 3 of the Proposed Route (five 'inbound' stops towards the city centre and four 'outbound' stops).

9.253. The R137 New Street South commences at the R137 Clanbrassil Street Lower / Malpas Street / Long Lane junction. R137 New Street South in Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme is a two-way carriageway and is approximately 15.0m in width. The road is subject to a 50 km/h speed limit and, for the most part, has a landscaped median separating the northbound and southbound carriageways. Most junctions along R137 New Street South are minor priority junctions providing access to residential streets and commercial properties. The priority junctions provide signage and road markings such as broken white lines and, in some instances, yellow box markings to allow vehicles travelling in and out of the minor arms.

9.254. The existing major junction arrangements are as follows:

- R137 New Street South / Malpas Street / Long Lane; and
- R137 New Street South / R110 Kevin Street Upper.

9.255. Along Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme, there is a total of 199 existing parking / loading spaces. Of the existing parking spaces, 60 spaces are located along the Proposed Scheme corridor and the remaining 139 spaces are located along side roads approximately 250m of the Proposed Scheme.

#### Potential Impacts

9.256. For the purpose of the assessment of potential impacts the NTA has also considered the proposed route in 3 sections as above. The division line between sections has been determined by grouping similar carriageway types together. These sections have been further subdivided into seven sub-sections, according to the types of construction works required. The sections / sub-sections are the following:

- Section 1: R817 Kimmage Road Lower from Kimmage Cross Roads to Junction with Harold's Cross Road:
  - Section 1a: Kimmage Cross Roads to Ravensdale Park;
  - Section 1b: R817 Kimmage Road Lower - Ravensdale Park / Sundrive / Harold's Cross; and
  - Section 1c: Kenilworth Park / Harold's Cross Road Junction.
- Section 2: Harold's Cross Road from Harold's Cross Park to Grand Canal; and
- Section 3: Clanbrassil Street Upper and Lower and New Street South from the Grand Canal to the Patrick Street Junction:
  - Section 3a: Grand Canal Bridge / Clanbrassil Street Upper;
  - Section 3b: Clanbrassil Street Upper / Clanbrassil Street Lower; and
  - Section 3c: Clanbrassil Street Lower / New Street South.

9.257. I will consider potential impacts in relation to the individual mode, i.e. walking, cycling, bus and private car with reference to the relevant section and in relation to both the construction and operational phases of the development.

#### Construction phase

9.258. Access to and egress from the Construction Compounds will be permitted via dedicated construction access routes for vehicles. The haulage of material on-site is anticipated to be minimal. There will however be the removal of excavated material and the delivery of construction materials to site. It is anticipated that the exporting and delivery of materials will be executed as efficiently as possible along national roads such as the close by M50 Motorway and from the Regional Road network. It is assumed that all National and Regional Roads including the Regional Roads in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Scheme will be used to supply / remove this material, where practicable, to minimise use of the local road network. The following National Road is expected to be used as construction vehicle access routes during the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme:

- M50 Motorway.

9.259. The following Regional Roads are expected to be used as construction access routes during the Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme:

- R805 R137 Tallaght Road - Templeogue Road;
- R817 Cypress Road - Kimmage Road Lower;
- R137 Spawell Road and Terenure Road North;
- R817 Fortfield Road –Kimmage Road Lower; and
- R818 Terenure Road West.

9.260. Given the length and varying nature of each sub-section, it is proposed to establish three Construction Compounds for the duration of the works. These are:

- Construction Compound K1: Sundrive Road;
- Construction Compound K2: Our Lady's Hospice; and
- Construction Compound K3: Clanbrassil Street Lower.

9.261. Based on construction activities associated with the Proposed Scheme, the maximum number of HGVs expected to be in operation across the Proposed Scheme during peak haulage activities is nine vehicles. Traffic flows on all routes and at site

compounds and works areas will be managed by the construction traffic management plan and the magnitude of impacts arising from these movements is stated as **Negative, Slight and Temporary**. No further analysis is therefore carried out in this regard by the applicant. Given the levels are comfortably below the thresholds set out in TII's Guidelines for Traffic and Transport Assessments.

9.262. Disruptions to pedestrian and cycle movement will also occur on a temporary basis as works proceed, however alternative routes and access will be provided as required. Similarly bus stops may require temporary relocation but access will be retained in order ensure continuity in the service.

9.263. Overall, the magnitude of impacts associated with the construction of the proposed scheme range between Negative, Slight and Temporary to Negative, Moderate and Temporary.

#### Operational Phase

9.264. In terms of the operational impacts, I note that the assessment of impacts relates to the functionality of the infrastructure to be provided. The applicant has developed a set of criteria for each mode which are outlined in tables 6.18 and 6.19 for pedestrians and cyclists, respectively. Similarly bus infrastructure is examined in relation to both the frequency of service to be provided and the infrastructure such as shelter, seating, accessible kerbs etc.

9.265. In relation to parking the applicant has outlined the number of spaces to be lost at each location which is set out hereunder and has provided a justification for such losses and in some cases has provided alternative solutions. The applicant has also examined parking and loading requirements for businesses in the area. Several third parties have raised concerns within their submissions in relation to loss of on street car parking. Concern has also been raised with regard to parking spaces being favoured over pedestrians and cyclists at 169 – 199 LKR to facilitate businesses. This it is contended, by third parties, is contrary to policy. Such issues have been examined within the assessment part of this report above and will not be repeated hereunder, this section of the EIAR should therefore be read in conjunction with the assessment

section of this report. It is important to note however that no significant effects are expected to arise in this regard and the applicant has demonstrated that adequate car parking has been retained within both the on-street locations (as detailed below) and within private residences (as detailed within the assessment section above).

#### Pedestrian Infrastructure.

9.266. In terms of operational impact in relation to pedestrian infrastructure it is important to note at the outset that all impacts to all three sections of the proposed scheme are expected to be positive and long term. This is as a result of the proposed improvements to the existing pedestrian facilities in the form of additional crossing locations, increased pedestrian directness, provision of traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds, improved accessibility and increased footpath and crossing widths. I note that all facilities have been designed in accordance with the principles of DMURS and the National Disability Authority (NDA) 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design Approach' (NDA 2020) with regards to catering for all users, including those with disabilities. For ease of reference details of Significance of Effects for Pedestrian Junctions is set out in Tables 6.12 & Table 6.13 of the EIAR. Pedestrian Impact during Operational Phase are outlined in Tables 6.18, 6.23 & 6.28 of the EIAR.

#### Cycle Infrastructure

9.267. Cycle infrastructure impacts are also considered to be positive and long term in terms of magnitude of effects. A number of submissions raised concerns in relation to junction layouts, cycle lane widths, treatment of cycle lanes at bus stops and the turning movements provided for cyclists at junctions. Similar to the foregoing all issues have been examined in detail within the assessment section of this report and will not be repeated hereunder, save to say that I am satisfied that the design approach to this infrastructure has been adequately justified by the applicant and I am satisfied that no significant negative impacts will arise in this regard. The use of dedicated cycle lanes, quiet roads in the case of cyclist diversions from the main route and the segregation of general traffic will provide for a significantly enhanced experience for cyclists over that currently available. I am satisfied that the applicants have examined the potential

for impacts to arise in relation to the proposed cycle infrastructure and have examined all reasonable alternatives in this regard also.

### Bus Infrastructure

- 9.268. Under the proposals, there will be a total of 15 stops – six inbound, seven outbound and two orbital stops. It is proposed to remove / rationalise two inbound stops (Stop 2438 and 2439) and provide one new inbound stop between these stops. In addition to rationalising the inbound bus stops, it is proposed to relocate six of the existing bus stops. Table 6.20 of the EIAR outlines a summary of the changes to the bus stop infrastructure along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme. The layout of new bus stops is considered to better serve the existing and future catchment and be closer to existing and new pedestrian crossing facilities for improved convenience.
- 9.269. Along Section 1 it is proposed that all bus stops provide real time / timetable information, and accessible kerbs. It is also proposed for all bus stops along the section to provide shelter and seating. There are also no indented bus bays proposed along Section 1, which alleviates the risk of re-entry delays to the operation of buses.
- 9.270. It is proposed to reduce the number of bus stops along Section 2 from three to two, through the rationalisation of two bus stops (1344 and 1345) on the inbound carriageway. These are proposed to be replaced by a single stop between them. The contents of Table 6-25 outline a summary of the improvements to the bus stop infrastructure along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme. There are also no indented bus bays proposed along Section 2. It should also be noted that the majority of bus stops are proposed within dedicated bus lanes and therefore will have a limited impact to the flow of general traffic. Table 6.6 of the EIAR outlines a summary of the changes to the bus stop infrastructure along Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme.
- 9.271. There are currently nine bus stops along Section 3 of the Proposed Route (five 'inbound' stops towards the city centre and four 'outbound' stops). The bus stops cater for five Dublin Bus routes (9, 16, 16c, 49 and 54a). Under the proposals, there will be a total of eight stops (four 'inbound' stops towards the City Centre and four 'outbound' stops). It is proposed to rationalisation of two stops on the inbound carriageway (2635

and 2636) and outbound carriageway (2387 and 2388) and provide a new inbound and outbound stop between them. Additionally, a new outbound stop is proposed to the south of St. Vincent Street South. The layout of new bus stops is considered to better serve the existing and future catchment and be closer to existing and new pedestrian crossing facilities for improved convenience. Table 6.30 of the EIAR outlines a summary of the improvements to the bus stop infrastructure along Section 3 of the Proposed Scheme.

9.272. The layout of new bus stops is considered to better serve the existing and future catchment and be closer to existing and new pedestrian crossing facilities for improved convenience. The magnitude of effects arising from the operation of the proposed new bus stops is expected to be **positive and very significant and Long - Term**.

9.273. Similar to the foregoing infrastructure, issues have been raised in relation to the relocation of some bus stops, the accessibility of bus stops, suitability of location and width of footpaths. See assessment section above for detailed assessment of bus stops, junction design, pedestrian footpaths and public realm.

9.274. Based on the information submitted and the NTA responses to the concerns raised as outlined within the assessment section of this report, I am satisfied that the applicant has adequately justified the proposed alterations to bus stops. I also note that all bus stops will have accessible kerbs and real time information and the majority will also have shelters which is currently not the case at all stops. Overall, the accessibility and reliability of the bus service will be significantly improved to that currently available. Such improvements will have a positive and long-term impact for patrons and will not result in any significant negative effects.

### Parking

#### Section 1

9.275. The Proposed Scheme will impact on some existing parking and loading locations along Section 1. As shown in Table 6-22 of the EIAR, the proposed amendments to parking / loading will result in a loss of 39 spaces along Section 1. The main changes are as follows:



- It is proposed to remove three informal parking spaces on Ravensdale Park located adjacent to Poddle Park. It is proposed to formalise the remaining four informal parking spaces.
- There are currently 22 informal, part-time parking spaces southwest of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road Junction, adjacent to the R817 Kimmage Road Lower southbound carriageway. It is proposed to remove a total of six spaces, and to allow full-time use of the remaining 16 spaces.
- There are currently 52 off-street, permit parking spaces located within a private car park on the southwest arm of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. It is proposed to formalise parking arrangements at this location however there will be no change to the overall number of parking spaces at this location.
- There are currently two taxi rank parking spaces on the southwest arm (Sundrive Road) of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. It is proposed to remove the two taxi spaces and provide cycle lanes along this section of Sundrive Road. Three taxi bays are proposed in a car park located 20m northwest of the existing location to mitigate this loss.
- There are currently 17 informal spaces on the southwest arm (Sundrive Road) of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. It is proposed to remove 14 informal parking spaces and provide cycle lanes along this section of Sundrive Road.
- There are currently 24 Pay & Display parking spaces on the southwest arm (Sundrive Road) of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. It is proposed to reduce the number of parking spaces from 24 to 12 Pay & Display spaces plus three taxi spaces.
- There are currently four informal parking spaces on the northeast arm (R817 Kimmage Road Lower) of the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. It is proposed to formalize the parking at this location by removing one space and providing three designated parking bays.

- There are currently two permit parking spaces located south of the R137 Harold's Cross Park Junction adjacent to the southbound carriageway. It is proposed to remove both spaces to provide continuous cycle facilities. The ten permit spaces to the south will be retained

9.276. Where parking is removed, the impact varies between negligible and slight. The loss of car parking is primarily as a result of the loss of informal and Pay & Display parking at the R817 Kimmage Road Lower / Sundrive Road / Larkfield Avenue junction. The loss of car parking is considered acceptable in the context of improved accessibility to this local area (on foot, by bicycle and bus) for residents and visitors to local shops and businesses.

**Magnitude of Impact:** Negative, Slight and Long-Term

Section 2,

9.277. The proposed amendments to parking / loading will result in an overall increase of twelve parking spaces along Section 2. The main changes are as follows:

- There are currently 10 permit parking spaces located north of the R137 Harold's Cross Road / Clare's Avenue Junction adjacent to the northbound carriageway. It is proposed to remove the 10 spaces at this location. A new off street car park comprising 22 permit / paid parking spaces is proposed approximately 40m north of this location.
- There are seven parking spaces located north of the R137 Harold's Cross Road / Clare's Avenue Junction adjacent to the southbound carriageway. Of these, six are permit parking and one is a designated disabled parking bay. It is proposed to remove two permit parking spaces. To offset the impact of the parking reduction new on-street permit / paid parking (four spaces) is proposed approximately 100m to the north of this location.
- It is proposed to remove two permit parking spaces located south of the Grand Canal adjacent to the R137 Harold's Cross Road southbound carriageway, to provide continuous bus and cycle facilities along the carriageway.

9.278. The effect is considered acceptable in the context of the planned outcome of the Proposed Scheme, which is to improve accessibility to this local area (on foot, by bicycle and bus) for residents and visitors to local shops and businesses. Cognisance is had to the provision of new car parking spaces and availability of alternative permit and Pay & Display parking on neighbouring roads.

**Magnitude of Impact:** Negligible and Long-term effect.

### Section 3

9.279. As shown in Table 6-32 of the EIAR proposed amendments to parking / loading will result in a loss of 19 spaces along Section 3. The main changes are as follows:

- It is proposed to remove one Pay & Display / permit parking space south of the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper / Clanbrassil Close Junction adjacent to the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper northbound carriageway.
- It is proposed to remove three Pay & Display / permit parking spaces located north of the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper / Clanbrassil Close Junction adjacent to the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper southbound carriageway.
- It is proposed to remove one Pay & Display / permit parking spaces located north of the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper / Wesley Place Junction adjacent to the R137 Clanbrassil St. Upper northbound carriageway.
- It is proposed to remove all 21 Pay and Display / permit parking spaces between South Circular Road and Lombard Street West to provide continuous cycle facilities. Off-street residential parking is available to the rear of the properties, two additional parking spaces are proposed in Vincent Street car park (Bottle Bank) and five additional Pay and Display / permit spaces are proposed approximately 100m to the north.
- It is proposed to relocate one loading bay on the R137 New Street South southbound carriageway south of the R137 New Street South / Kevin Street Upper Junction (approximately 15m south of the current location).

**Magnitude of Impact:** Negligible and Long-term effect.

9.280. Overall, there will be a total loss of 46 parking spaces along the Proposed Scheme. Given the availability of equivalent types of parking along adjacent streets within 200m of these locations (and typically within under 100m), the overall impact of this loss of parking is considered acceptable. Cognisance being had to the location of the proposed development within an urban highly accessible area and that spaces are to be lost to facilitate enhanced walking, cycling and bus infrastructure, I am satisfied that the loss of spaces is justified. I am also satisfied that no significant effects arise in this regard.

Summary of infrastructure to be provided.

9.281. The proposed scheme will increase the number of pedestrian signal crossings (incl. at junctions) from 35 to 47. It will also provide 1.75 km inbound and 1.75 km outbound of segregated cycle facilities, excluding quiet street treatment. The proportion of segregated cycle facilities (incl. quiet street) will increase from 3.2Km on the existing corridor to 4Km on the proposed scheme. The proportion of the route having bus priority measures will increase from 18% on the existing corridor to 100% on the Proposed Scheme.

9.282. While parking will reduce by 46 spaces, the majority of these are commercial spaces and have a range of alternative parking spaces within a 200m vicinity/ on side streets.

9.283. In terms of the modelled benefits of the proposed scheme, I draw the Board's attention to section 6.4.6.2.1 of the EIAR in which the movement of people is assessed. Modelling examines the potential for modal shift in the years 2028 and 2043 in relation to the am and pm peak times. The most significant shift is seen in the 2028 AM Peak Hour increase in people travelling by bus, an increase of 80%. In the year 2028 during the am peak it is predicted that walking and cycling will see an increase of 8%. Private car use for the same year is predicted to decrease by 50%. The PM peak for the same year is predicted to have a reduction of 35% in the number of people travelling via car, an increase of 79% in the number of people travelling via bus and an increase in 34% in the number of people walking or cycling along the Proposed Scheme.

9.284. Modelled modal shifts for the year 2043 also see a significant increase in people walking and cycling with a 81% increase in people moved as a result of the Proposed Scheme and 10% increase in people moved by sustainable modes (Public Transport, Walk, Cycle) in the am peak hour. There is a decrease of 47% in the number of people travelling via car, an increase of 8% in the number of people travelling via bus and an increase of 161% in the number of people walking and cycling along the Proposed Scheme during the PM Peak Hour. The results indicate 18% increase in people moved as a result of the Proposed Scheme and 46% increase in people moved by sustainable modes (Public Transport, Walk, Cycle) in the pm peak hour.

9.285. The overall magnitude of the forgoing modelled changes has been adjudged to deliver a **positive, significant and long-term effect** in terms of People Movement by sustainable modes. It is clear from the information provided that the proposed development will be a significant piece of infrastructure that will assist in the reduction of GHG in Dublin City and will have a significantly positive impact on the sustainability of the city.

9.286. It is clear that the improvements proposed will create the conditions for a modal shift to more sustainable modes of travel. Improved bus times and scheduling, travel information and accessibility to the bus infrastructure are positive changes that are supported at both a national and local level in terms of policy.

9.287. It must be clarified that the initial modelling for the years 2028 and 2043 were based on current metrics for population, traffic levels etc. I note that the applicant has resilience tested the proposed scheme in relation to population and traffic growth. The results of which demonstrate that the proposed scheme will have adequate capacity to cope with such changes without impacting the reliability of the service.

#### General traffic impacts

9.288. Given the improvements to bus priority, walking and cycling as a result of the Proposed Scheme, there will likely be an overall reduction in operational capacity for general traffic along the direct study area.

9.289. It is predicted in the EIAR that:

- Along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme, Clanbrassil Street experiences a very significant reduction in up to - 639 combined traffic flows. There is also a slight decrease of -297 flows on New Street South and -170 on Patrick Street.
- Along Section 2, there is a significant reduction of -935 combined flows along Kimmage Road Lower and a decrease of -344 combined flows on Harold's Cross Road.
- Along Section 3, there is a reduction of -480 on Wainsfort Road. Cypress Road experiences a reduction of -143.

9.290. This may in turn result in some level of redistribution of general traffic away from the main corridor onto the surrounding road network. The surrounding road network including junctions has therefore been examined in detail within the EIAR submitted and has been carried out in accordance with TII's Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines.

9.291. I highlight that there is a moderate to significant reduction of between -143 and - 935 general traffic flows along the direct study area during the AM Peak Hour in the opening year 2028, which is attributed to the Proposed Scheme and the associated modal shift as a result of its implementation. This reduction in general traffic flow has been determined as an overall **Positive, Slight to Very Significant and Long-Term** on the direct study area. The most significant effect occurs along Kimmage Road Lower which is part of Section 2 of the Proposed Scheme.

9.292. The road links which experience additional traffic volumes / an increase of over 100 combined general traffic flows are set out in Table 6.48 of the EIAR and Road Links where the 100 Flow Additional Traffic Threshold is Exceeded (AM Peak Hour) (Indirect Study Area) is set out in Table 6.49 of the EIAR.

9.293. As outlined in the contents of Table 6-50, the additional traffic on the road links that exceed the threshold for further assessment varies between +102 and +253 combined flows during the AM Peak Hour. In addition to the general traffic flow reductions occurring along the direct study area, there are key reductions in general traffic noted along certain road links within the indirect study area during the PM Peak Hour. The

key reductions in traffic flows along the indirect study area during the PM Peak Hour are outlined in Table 6-51. The blue links indicate where a reduction of at least -100 combined traffic flows may occur.

9.294. As indicated in Table 6-51, Road Links that Experience a Reduction of at least -100 Combined Flows during PM Peak Hour (Direct Study Area) (pcus), the traffic flow reductions vary between -218 and -1009 combined flows. Along Section 1 of the Proposed Scheme, Clanbrassil Street experiences a reduction in up to -487 combined traffic flows. There are also reductions on Patrick Street with -218 and New Street South with -383. Along Section 2, there is a significant reduction on Kimmage Road Lower of -1009. There is also a large reduction of -682 on Harold's Cross. Along Section 3, there are reductions of -391 on Wainsfort Road and of -128 on Cypress Road.

9.295. In addition to the general traffic flow reductions occurring along the direct study area, there are key reductions in general traffic noted along certain road links within the indirect study area during the PM Peak Hour. The key reductions in traffic flows along the indirect study area during the PM Peak Hour are outlined in Table 6-52. It indicates that the traffic reductions vary between -123 and -622 combined flows along the surrounding road links.

9.296. The redistributed traffic as a result of the Proposed Scheme results in a negative impact upon the road links identified in Table 6-53 during the PM Peak Hour. In order to determine the significance of the negative impact, a further assessment has been carried out subsequently. Operational capacity outputs have been extracted from the LAM at the associated junctions along the subject road links to determine whether there is reserve capacity to facilitate the uplift in traffic. The results are presented in terms of the significance of the impact to the V / C ratio for each junction based on its Sensitivity and Magnitude of Impact.

9.297. The results of the analysis presented in Appendix A6.4 and summarised in Table 6-56 demonstrate that the majority of junctions are operating at a maximum V / C ratio of below 85% during the AM Peak Hour in the 2028 scenario. This indicates that these junctions are operating well, with spare capacity that could accommodate additional

traffic that may occur because of traffic redistribution following the delivery of the Proposed Scheme. A negligible impact is predicted at 55 of the 57 junctions assessed. The effect of redistributed traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme is deemed Not Significant and Long-Term at 54 junctions of the 57 junctions assessed and Imperceptible and Long-Term at two of the junctions. At the remaining junction, that of Clogher Road and Sundrive Road, the impact is Negative, Moderate and Long Term.

9.298. The results of the analysis presented in Appendix A6.4 and summarised in Table 6-57 demonstrate that the majority of junctions are operating at a maximum V / C ratio of below 85% during the PM Peak Hour in the 2028 scenario. This indicates that these junctions are operating well, with spare capacity that could accommodate additional traffic that may occur as a result of traffic redistribution following the delivery of the Proposed Scheme. A negligible impact is predicted at 76 of the 79 junctions assessed. The effect of redistributed traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme is deemed Not Significant and Long-Term at 74 junctions of the 79 junctions assessed and Imperceptible and Long-Term at three of the junctions. At two of these junctions the V / C ratio is over 100% in both the Do Something and Do Minimum scenarios those being:

- St Agnes Road / Cromwellsfort Road / Kimmage Road West / Whitehall Road West; and
- Stannaway Road / Sundrive Road.

9.299. At the remaining junctions (two) the impact is Negative, Moderate and Long-Term, those being.

- Clogher Road / Kildare Road and
- Donore Avenue / South Circular Road.

9.300. The results of the analysis presented in Appendix A6.4 of the EIAR demonstrate that all junctions are operating at a maximum V / C ratio of below 85% during the AM Peak Hour in the 2043 DoSomething scenario and experience a negligible Magnitude of Impact. This indicates that these junctions are operating well and could accommodate additional traffic that may occur as a result of traffic redistribution



following the delivery of the Proposed Scheme. The Proposed Scheme is deemed to have an Imperceptible to Not Significant impact on the majority of junctions assessed. A **Negligible and Long-Term** impact is predicted at all 57 junctions assessed. The effect of redistributed traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme is deemed **Not Significant and Long-Term** at 55 junctions of the 57 junctions assessed and **Imperceptible and Long-Term** at two of the junctions. At each junction assessed, performance is similar with or without the Proposed Scheme in place. As a result, the impact is expected to have a Negative, Not Significant and Long-Term effect at worst when combining the magnitude of the impact with the sensitivity of the road. Therefore, no further assessment into these junctions has been undertaken. Given that the redistributed traffic will not lead to a significant deterioration of the operational capacity on the surrounding road network during the 2043 Do Something scenario, no further mitigation measures have been considered to alleviate the impact outside of the direct study area.

9.301. The results of the analysis presented in Appendix A6.4 and summarised in Table 6-58 of the EIAR demonstrate that the majority of junctions are operating at a maximum V / C ratio of below 85% during the PM Peak Hour in the 2043 Do Something scenario and experience a negligible Magnitude of Impact. This indicates that these junctions are operating well and could accommodate additional traffic that may occur as a result of traffic redistribution following the delivery of the Proposed Scheme. The Proposed Scheme is deemed to have an **Imperceptible to Not Significant** impact on the majority of junctions presented in Table 6-58.

9.302. A **Negligible** impact is predicted at 78 of the 79 junctions assessed. The effect of redistributed traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme is deemed **Not Significant and Long-Term** at 76 junctions of the 79 junctions assessed and **Imperceptible and Long-Term** at two of the junctions. Of those junctions with impacts assessed as not significant two junctions have V / C ratios of over 100% in both the Do minimum and Do Something scenarios, those are:

- St Agnes Road / Cromwellsfort Road / Kimmage Road West / Whitehall Road West.

- High Street / Nicholas Street / St Michaels Hill / Clanbrassil Street Upper / Christchurch Place.

9.303. At the remaining junction, the impact is low (at one junction) and when combining the magnitude of impact with the road sensitivity, there is predominately a **Negative, Moderate and Long-Term effect**. Given that the redistributed traffic will not lead to a significant deterioration of the operational capacity on the surrounding road network during the 2043 Do Something scenario, no further mitigation measures have been considered to alleviate the impact outside of the direct study area.

9.304. The night-time traffic redistribution effect will be **Negligible and Long Term** during the night-time period.

9.305. It is noted that while there are low impacts to the operational capacity in the indirect study area, this level of congestion is acceptable according to national guidance. Section 3.4.2 of DMURS (Government of Ireland 2019) recognises that a certain level of traffic congestion is an inevitable feature within urban networks and that junctions may have to operate at saturation levels for short periods of time during the peak hours of the day. Chapter 1 of the Smarter Travel Policy Document (DoT 2019c) also acknowledges that it is not feasible or sustainable to accommodate continued demand for car use. Therefore, it can be concluded that the traffic congestion that is outlined in the impact assessment is acceptable with regard to the urban location of the area.

9.306. I highlight that, it is determined that there will be an overall Negative, Slight and Long-Term impact from the redistributed general traffic as a result of the Proposed Scheme. Given that the redistributed traffic will not lead to a significant deterioration of the operational capacity on the surrounding road network, no further mitigation measures have been considered to alleviate the impact outside of the direct study area. It should therefore be considered that the traffic congestion that is outlined in the impact assessment is acceptable with regard to the urban location of the area in the context of the increased movement of people overall and on sustainable modes in particular.

9.307. As outlined within Section 6.4 and summarised in Table 6-59, the Proposed Scheme will deliver strong positive impacts to the quality of pedestrian, cycling and bus infrastructure during the Operational Phase providing for enhanced levels of People Movement in line with the scheme objectives. These improvements will help to provide an attractive alternative to the private car and promote a modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport, allowing for greater capacity and comfort along the corridor to facilitate the sustainable movement of people as population and employment levels grow in the future.

#### Mitigation

9.308. Construction related mitigation will be included within the CEMP. Implementation of the CEMP will ensure disruption and nuisance are kept to a minimum during the Construction Phase. The CEMP has regard to the guidance contained in the TII Guidelines for the Creation, Implementation and Maintenance of an Environmental Operating Plan, and the handbook published by Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) in the UK, Environmental Good Practice on Site Guide, 4th Edition (CIRIA 2015).

9.309. A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared and included in the CEMP, and subsequently implemented, by the appointed contractor prior to construction, including Temporary Traffic Management arrangements prepared in accordance with Department of Transport's 'Traffic Signs Manual, Chapter 8 Temporary Traffic Measures and Signs for Roadworks'. The CTMP will be consulted upon with the road authority and will include measures to minimise the impacts associated with the Construction Phase upon the peak periods of the day.

9.310. No mitigation measures are proposed for the operation of the proposed scheme. Residual impacts remain as stated above and will not be significant.

9.311. I considered all of the written submissions made in relation to traffic and transport, and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts on traffic and transport can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation

measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on traffic and transport can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

*Table 16 Traffic & Transport – Summary of potential and residual effects.*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
<b>Construction phase impacts Road network operation</b>	Negative, Slight and Long-Term	Traffic management Plans	Negative, Slight and Long-Term
<b>Operational Phase</b>			
<b>Pedestrian Infrastructure</b>	Positive, Moderate to Significant and Long-Term in section 1 & 2 and Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term in section 3	None	Positive, Moderate to Significant and Long-Term in section 1 & 2 and Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term in section 3
<b>Cycling Infrastructure</b>	Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term in Section 1 and 3 and Positive, Moderate and Long-Term in Section	None	Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term in Section 1 and 3 and Positive, Moderate and Long-Term in Section
<b>Bus Infrastructure</b>	Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term in Section 1 and 3 and Positive, Moderate and Long-Term in Section	None	Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term in Section 1 and 3 and Positive, Moderate and Long-Term in Section
<b>Parking and Loading</b>	Negative, Slight and Long-Term in Section 1, 2 and 3	none	Negative, Slight and Long-Term in Section

<b>People Movement</b>	Positive, Significant and Long-term	None	Positive, Significant and Long-term
<b>Bus Network Performance Indicators</b>	Positive, Significant and Long-term	None	Positive, Significant and Long-term
<b>General Traffic Network Performance Indicators</b>  <b>Reduction in general traffic flows along the Proposed Scheme.</b>  <b>Redistributed general traffic along the surrounding road network in the indirect study area as a result of the reduction of reserve capacity along the Proposed Scheme.</b>	Positive, Slight to Profound and Long-Term  Negative, Slight and Long-Term	None	Positive, Moderate and Long-term effect whilst the impact of the redistributed general traffic along the surrounding road network will have a Negative, Slight and Long-term effect.  Negative, Slight and Long-Term

## Material Assets & Waste

10.1. Chapters 18 & 19 of the EIAR examines the potential for impacts to arise in relation to waste and material assets. The study area regarding major infrastructure and utilities comprises all areas within the Proposed Scheme, including both permanent and temporary land take boundaries. The study area for waste has been carried out on a regional basis and encompasses Dublin and the Eastern-Midlands.

### Material Assets

10.2. All major infrastructure and utilities which may be impacted by the Proposed Scheme have been assessed including:

- Major Infrastructure (Grand canal)

- Electricity
- Water
- Wastewater & Surface Water Drainage
- Gas and
- Telecommunications

10.3. The applicant has identified several utilities in place along and crossing the Proposed Scheme roads, the majority of which are buried within and along the roadways. These utilities include:

- ESB electricity lines (high, medium, and low voltage) and associated infrastructure;
- Gas Networks Ireland gas mains (high, medium, and low pressure) and associated infrastructure;
- Irish Water potable water mains and associated infrastructure;
- Irish Water sewer lines (foul and combined sewers) and associated infrastructure;
- Local Authority surface water drainage network and associated infrastructure;
- Eir, Enet and Virgin Media telecommunications lines and associated infrastructure;
- Local Authority traffic signal ducting; and

10.4. It is important to note at the outset that significant effects are not likely to arise in relation to the proposed development during either the construction phase or operational phase of the development.

10.5. Impacts on existing infrastructure and utilities may occur in order to accommodate changes to junction layouts or changes to carriageway widths. Where protection of utilities in place is not an option, this will involve realignment, upgrade, or replacement of this infrastructure as part of works within those areas.

- 10.6. I note from the information submitted that the proposed development would require the diversion of medium and low voltage underground and overhead lines, watermains and telecommunication ducts and chambers. These diversions will result in temporary and short-term interruptions to services in the vicinity of the proposed works.
- 10.7. The magnitude of effects arising from infrastructure diversions ranges between **Negative, Slight, Temporary, Negative, Not Significant, Short-Term, Negative, Moderate, Temporary to No Significant Impact**. Impacts relating to each individual infrastructure element is outlined in Table 19.10 of the EIAR submitted. Impacts arising to such infrastructure during the operational phase of the development relate to the use of electricity to power new traffic lights and street lighting. Overall effects are expected to be Negative, Imperceptible and Long-Term in this regard.
- 10.8. In considering the impacts to material assets, I note that the applicant has also considered the impact of the development on imported materials, such as concrete and aggregate. No significant effects are expected in relation to imported materials during either phase of the development.

#### Waste

- 10.9. Construction waste, including demolition and excavation waste, will be the main type of waste generated as a result of the Proposed Scheme. Waste licenced facilities within the area have been identified and will be used according to the waste management plan which will be submitted to the relevant Council.
- 10.10. It is important to note at the outset that impacts arising from waste are not deemed to be significant.
- 10.11. It is the intention of the applicant to monitor, manage, reduce and reuse waste where possible. Waste will be appropriately segregated. It is anticipated that up to 32,500 tonnes of recycled or reused material could be incorporated into the Proposed Scheme. All monitoring and auditing of waste will form part of the mitigation measures to reduce waste arising from the development in compliance with Article 27 of the Waste Directive Regulations.

10.12. Where practicable and appropriate, and if in reusable condition, materials to be reused include street and roadside infrastructure such as bus stops, lighting poles, traffic signals, manhole access covers and signs.

10.13. I have examined the waste estimates provided by the applicant and note the following in relation to construction waste:

- Estimates of demolition waste types and quantities are outlined in Table 18.8 of the EIAR and result in a total predicted amount of 580 tonnes which equates to 0.005% of the demolition waste in the Eastern Midlands Waste Region. The magnitude of effects relating to demolition waste when considered in the context of the region are stated to be **adverse, not significant and short-term**.
- Excavation waste is outlined in table 18.9 of the EIAR and a total of 27,000 tonnes is expected to be generated from the development which equates to 0.23% of the demolition waste in the Eastern Midlands Waste Region. The magnitude of effects when taken in the context of the region is stated as being **adverse, slight and short-term**.
- Waste also relates to waste construction materials which has been quantified by the applicant within Table 18.10, whereby it is expected that 5-15% of materials used will be wasted. Such levels of waste are standard in construction and as such are not expected to give rise to significant impacts in the regional context. The Construction Phase of the Proposed Scheme is not predicted to give rise to significant impacts and all the impacts will be **adverse, Imperceptible and short-term**.

10.14. Operational waste may arise as a result of carriageway maintenance which will be undertaken at regular intervals, or as necessary. This will primarily consist of bituminous mixtures due to maintenance of carriageway pavement. It is envisaged that bituminous mixtures will be reused within new carriageway construction as far as practicable and in accordance with all applicable legislation. The quantity of bitumen-containing material generated over the assumed lifetime of the Proposed Scheme (60 years), will increase, compared to the Do Nothing scenario, by approximately 2,031



tonnes due to an overall widening of the carriageway. Therefore, there will be an increase in maintenance needs during operation of the Proposed Scheme, in comparison to required maintenance of the existing carriageway under the Do Nothing scenario. Therefore, the potential impact of operational construction and demolition waste will be **adverse, not significant and long-term**.

10.15. Given the limited percentage of waste to be generated from the site it is reasonable to state that cumulative effects arising from development along the route will not arise in this instance.

### Conclusion

**10.16.** I considered all of the written submissions made in relation to Waste & Material Assets and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts on Waste & Material Assets can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated by measures that form part of the proposed scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts on Waste & Material Assets can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

*Table 17 Material Assets & Waste – Summary of potential and residual effects*

Potential impacts	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Impact
<b>Construction Phase</b>			
<b>Demolition waste</b>	Adverse, Not Significant and Short-Term	Monitoring, auditing and reusing waste	Adverse, Not Significant and Short-Term

<b>Excavation waste</b>	Adverse, Slight and Short-Term	As above	Adverse, Slight and Short-Term
<b>Construction waste</b>	Adverse, Imperceptible and Short-Term	As above	Adverse, Imperceptible and Short-Term
<b>Municipal waste</b>	Adverse, Imperceptible and Short-Term	As above	Adverse, Imperceptible and Short-Term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Electricity</b></li> <li>• <b>Water / Wastewater</b></li> <li>• <b>Surface Water Drainage</b></li> <li>• <b>Gas</b></li> <li>• <b>Telecommunications</b></li> </ul>	Range between – Negative, Slight, Temporary, Negative, Not Significant, Short-Term, Negative, Moderate, Temporary, No Significant Impact.	Notification and liaison with utility providers.	Range between - Negative, Slight, Temporary, Negative, Not Significant, Short-Term, Negative, Moderate, Temporary, No Significant Impact.
<b>Operational Phase</b>			
<b>C&amp; D Waste</b>	Adverse, Not Significant and Long-Term	Reuse waste	Adverse, Not Significant and Long term
<b>Municipal Waste</b>	Neutral and Long-Term	Monitoring, auditing and reusing waste	Neutral and Long-Term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Electricity</b></li> <li>• <b>Water / Wastewater</b></li> <li>• <b>Surface Water Drainage</b></li> </ul>	Ranges between: No significant impact &	Notification and liaison with utility providers.	Ranges between: No significant impact to Negative,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gas</b></li> <li>• <b>Telecommunications</b></li> </ul>	Negative, Imperceptible, and Long-Term		Imperceptible, Moderate, and Temporary
---	--	--	--

### **Risk of major accidents and / or disaster**

10.17. An assessment of the risk of major accidents or disasters is outlined in chapter 20 of the EIAR. In terms of potential risks, it is of note that the proposed development gives rise to a neutral risk in relation to major accidents or disasters and will therefore not be considered further.

10.17.1. The applicant has identified potential impact of major accidents and/ or disasters from the Proposed Scheme during the construction phase. These include:

- Risk of gas explosion due to the strike of a gas mains during excavation works.
- Risk of structural damage / collapse of structures during construction.
- Contamination Event – Pollution event leading to environmental damage to watercourses or groundwater, particularly associated with the potential release of silt to the aquatic environment.
- Transport Incident-Major Road traffic accident resulting from a collision between construction traffic and public traffic i.e. cars, buses, Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), in addition to pedestrians and cyclists using the road or footpaths.
- Risk of spread of invasive species during construction works, particularly during site clearance works and
- Disruption to emergency response vehicles (fire, ambulance and Garda).

10.17.2. The design of the Proposed Scheme has been developed in compliance with the relevant design standards which include provisions to reduce the likelihood of risk events occurring (e.g., structures have been designed to avoid the risk of collapse, drainage systems have been designed to cater for increased rainfall

events, etc.). A CEMP has been prepared and is included as Appendix A5.1 in Volume 4 of the EIAR.

### Conclusion

I have considered all of the written submissions made in relation to Major Accidents or Disasters and the relevant contents of the file including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the potential for impacts from Major Accidents or Disasters can be avoided, managed and/ or mitigated by measures that form part of the Proposed Scheme, by the proposed mitigation measures and with suitable conditions. I am therefore satisfied that the potential for direct or indirect impacts from Major Accidents or Disasters can be ruled out. I am also satisfied that cumulative effects, in the context of existing and permitted development in the surrounding area and other existing and proposed development in the vicinity of the site, are not likely to arise.

*Table 18 Risk of Major Accidents or Disasters – Summary of potential and residual effects.*

Potential impacts during Construction Phase	Pre-Mitigation Risk	Mitigation	Post Mitigation Consequence & Risk
<b>Risk of gas explosion.</b>	Medium	See Section 9.5 and Ap. A5.1 CEMP)	Serious & Low
<b>Risk of collapse / structural damage</b>	Low	As above	Minor & Low
<b>Pollution event leading to environmental damage to watercourses or groundwater.</b>	Medium	As above	Serious & Medium
<b>Transport Accident - Major road traffic accident resulting from a collision between construction traffic and public traffic i.e. cars, buses, Heavy Goods</b>	Low	As Above	Limited & Low

<b>Vehicles (HGVs), in addition to pedestrians and cyclists using the road or footpaths.</b>			
<b>Biosecurity - Risk of spread of invasive species during construction works, particularly during site clearance works</b>	Medium	As Above	Serious & Medium
<b>Risk of spread of invasive species.</b>	Medium	As above	Serious & Low

### **Interactions between the Factors and Cumulative Impacts**

10.18. Chapter 21 of the EIAR considers the potential for cumulative impacts to arise and the potential for interactions between factors to occur. Cumulative impacts are considered in the context of other permitted and planned development in the area as well as the remaining 11 other bus connects routes in the context of the foregoing sections of the EIAR. Projects considered in the context of cumulative development include but are not limited to the following:

- Metrolink - 19km rail line running from Swords to Charlemont, majority of the line will be run underground via a single bore tunnel. Construction will commence and continue beyond the Schemes completion, and therefore use of waste capacity will not coincide.
- Dart Underground - 7.5km twin bore tunnel for electrified heavy rail in Dublin city centre, linking the Northern line to the Heuston Main line.
- Dublin Port Masterplan 2040 - Works include construction of new quays and jetties, remediation of contamination on the bed of the basin, capital dredging to deepen the basin, infilling of the Basin at some berth locations and

construction of a new river berth with a double tiered Ro-Ro ramp and deepening of fairway and approach to Dublin port.

- N2 Slane Bypass - 3.4km long bypass that runs from the east of Slane to the existing N2 at a location 500m north of McGruder's crossroads.
- Ardee bypass - 6km single carriageway, commencing in the townland of Mandistown to Glebe townland north of Ardee.
- M11 Capacity Enhancement (Phase 1 & Phase 2) including Glen of the Downs tunnel - The N11/M11 is 22 km in length between Junction 4 to Junction 14. The primary objectives of the scheme are to improve the efficiency of road based public transport and journey time, and to provide continuity of road type between Junction 6 and Junction 15. 2km tunnel under the west side of the Glen of the Downs.
- Blanchardstown Regional Drainage Scheme - The project involves the upgrade of the sewer network currently serving Blanchardstown, Mulhuddart and Castleknock as well as a number of towns in Meath.
- North Dublin sewage plant (pipeline) - Construction of an underground pipeline beginning at Blanchardstown which will collect and transfer sewage, via a new pumping station at Abbotstown to the plant at Clonshaugh. The treated water will be discharged through a 6km marine outfall pipeline.
- Water Supply Project –Eastern and Midlands Region Abstraction and treatment of water at Parteen Basin in Co. Tipperary, together with a 170km underground treated water pipeline from Parteen Basin to Dublin.
- Greater Dublin Drainage Project - The orbital sewer route will intercept an existing sewer at Blanchardstown and will divert it from this point to the proposed wastewater treatment plant at Clonshaugh (13.7km in length; 5.2km of a 1.4m diameter rising main and 8.5km of a 1.8m diameter gravity sewer).
- O'Devaney Gardens Regeneration Programme Development consists of 1,047 no. residential units across 10 no. blocks up to 14 storeys tall.

- Luas Cross City extension - Delivering an additional 30km of Luas Lines running to Lucan, Bray, Poolbeg and Finglas.
- Southern Port Access Route Deliver a new public road which links from the national road network at the Dublin Tunnel to serve the south port lands and adjoining areas.
- SDCC planning reference SD228/0008: construction of a combination of single way and two-way cycle tracks on and adjacent to the vehicle carriageway.
- Major Project (id MP34) - Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan.
- Clongriffin to City Centre Core Bus Corridor;
- Swords to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Blanchardstown to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Ballymun/Finglas to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Lucan to City Centre to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Liffey Valley to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Tallaght/Clondalkin to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Bray to City Centre Core Bus Corridor.
- Belfield/Blackrock to City Centre Core Bus Corridor; and
- Ringsend to City Centre Core Bus Corridor
- DCC planning reference 3513/19: demolition of remaining buildings and the construction of a 55- unit residential development over an underground car parking area for 57 cars.
- DCC planning reference 4423/19: mixed use development at 27-29 New Row South, Dublin 8.

- DCC planning reference 2654/20: demolition of existing 2-storey warehouse type structure and construction of a mixed-use development in a building ranging from 3 to 7 storeys over basement level.
- DCC planning reference 3779/22: demolition of existing buildings on site, with the exception of house number 152 (protected structure RPS. Ref. 889) and construction of a residential development, 3 and 4storey in height, containing a total of 22 apartments.
- SHD 308533: Alterations to Reg.Ref:2186/15 (PL29S.245164) increasing the total number of units from 220 no. units to 248 no. units.
- SHD 313043: 208 no. apartments and associated site works.
- LRD LRD6018/22-S3: construction of 208 no. social and affordable housing units within 5 no. blocks ranging in height up to 6 storeys.
- SID 306725: flood alleviation works along and adjacent to the River Poddle extending from the upper reaches of the river. Tymon North, Tallaght to Merchant's Quay, Dublin; a

10.19. The applicant has also had regard to the relevant plans for the area and I am satisfied that a robust and detailed assessment of the potential for cumulative impacts to arise has been carried out.

10.20. It is important to note at the outset that for the large part no significant cumulative impacts are expected.

#### Water, soils, geology and hydrogeology

10.21. Water, soils, geology and hydrogeology are examined as a group of receptors for the purpose of the consideration of cumulative effects. Standard mitigation measures as outlined within the relevant sections above will avoid significant impacts from arising in relation to such factors and therefore no significant effects are expected. Similarly, mitigation measures to avoid such impacts also form part of the permitted schemes



and I am therefore satisfied that significant cumulative impacts will not arise in this regard.

### Traffic

10.22. In the consideration of cumulative traffic impacts, the applicant in the first instance considered the cumulative impact of all 12 schemes and modelling exercise of a worst-case scenario was carried out. The results would give rise to significant traffic displacement across the Dublin area with significant impacts occurring on local residential roads as the carrying capacity of arterial routes is designed to cater for such volumes in traffic.

10.23. In order to prevent such significant impacts from arising the applicant has stated that a number of routes will not be constructed simultaneously. It is proposed to limit the number of Core Bus Corridor schemes which would be under construction concurrently as part of the proposed realistic worst-case scenario to manage overall construction impacts across the city region. The following schemes will not, therefore, be constructed concurrently with adjacent schemes to limit potential for significant adverse traffic, air quality and noise issues during the construction stage:

- Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme will not be constructed concurrently with the Proposed Scheme and the Bray to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme.
- Lucan to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme– will not be constructed concurrently with Liffey Valley to City Centre Core Bus Corridor and Blanchardstown to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Schemes.
- Bray to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme – will not be constructed concurrently with Belfield/ Blackrock and Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Schemes; and
- Ballymun/Finglas to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme – will not be constructed concurrently with Swords to City Centre Core Bus Corridor and Blanchardstown to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Schemes.

10.24. The proposed scheme will retain two-way traffic along the route for the duration of construction and will therefore maintain traffic flows. It is for this reason that significant cumulative traffic impacts are not expected. Similarly significant cumulative traffic impacts do not arise in relation to other developments in the area of the proposed scheme or in relation to the operation of the scheme.

#### Dust, Air Pollution & Climate

10.25. An appraisal has been carried out to assess the cumulative risk to sensitive receptors as a result of dust soiling and the health impacts and ecology impacts due to the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme. Other projects within 350 metres of the proposed scheme, as outlined above were considered in this regard. Mitigation measures to prevent dust are to be implemented as outlined within the relevant section above and as such no significant dust impacts are expected to arise in relation to the proposed scheme. Given that such mitigation is standard practice in relation to construction and excavation works it is reasonable to state that significant cumulative dust emissions are not expected to arise in relation to other development within the area. Such mitigation measures are included within the permitted schemes referred to and I am therefore satisfied given the limited nature of the proposed works and the measures proposed within it to avoid dust emissions, that no significant impacts will arise.

10.26. In terms of pollutants, I note that the applicant has outlined the cumulative construction phase in terms of a percentage of the regional output in Table 21.4 of the EIAR and given the relatively small percentage of pollutants that the scheme will give rise to in this context, no significant cumulative impacts are expected. Construction Phase traffic emissions from the Proposed Scheme, the other 11 Core Bus Corridor schemes are considered overall **Negative, Not Significant and Short-term.**

10.27. Cumulative impacts in relation to climate are considered within the EIAR within a national context. The impacts to climate have been quantified within the Air Quality and Climate Section of this EIAR above and will not be repeated hereunder, however it is important to note that impacts arising from the operation of the development are positive and the proposal will result in a reduction of carbon emissions over the life of

the scheme. As mentioned above construction impacts in terms of climate are considered to be significant this was determined in the absence of ceiling thresholds. This issue has been discussed in detail above and will not be repeated hereunder. However, in the context of the proposed development I acknowledge that the scheme will ultimately have a positive impact on climate I am therefore satisfied that significant long term adverse cumulative impacts will not arise.

#### Noise & Vibration

- 10.28. Cumulative impacts in relation to Noise and vibration have been examined in the context of the proposed 12 routes and the other projects listed in Appendix A21.1 Volume 4 of the EIAR. Eighteen projects were identified with the 300m Zone of Influence (Zoi) of the Proposed Scheme. These include 11 DCC planning applications, one SDCC planning application, four SHDs, one LRD, two other Major Projects (Potential Metro South alignment: SW option and the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan) and the Tallaght/Clondalkin to City Centre and Templeogue/Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor schemes.
- 10.29. In order to ensure that construction activities associated with the Proposed Scheme are controlled at the closest NSLs, a series of mitigation measures will be implemented throughout the construction phase. These measures are set out in Section 9.5.1.1 of Chapter 9 (Noise & Vibration) of the EIAR. With the implementation of the mitigation measures to reduce construction noise levels associated with the Proposed Scheme and due to the separation from the nearest other Core Bus Corridor scheme, there are no significant cumulative impacts predicted to occur from concurrent construction of the Proposed Scheme in combination with the other Core Bus Corridor schemes and other projects identified.
- 10.30. During the year of opening, under the cumulative traffic scenario, the same impacts are calculated along the roads impacted by the standalone scheme. There are thirteen roads which are determined to have an indirect, negative, moderate, short to medium term noise impact in accordance with the methodology outlined in Section 9.4.5.1 in Chapter 9 (Noise & Vibration) of the EIAR with all 12 Core Bus Corridor Schemes in place. One road is calculated to experience an indirect, Negative,

Moderate to Significant, Short to Medium Term impact. The impacts are calculated at roads outside of the Proposed Scheme due to traffic redistribution.

10.31. During the future design year, 2043, the predicted cumulative noise impacts are lower than the opening year along the same roads due to the lower magnitude of impact assigned to changes in road traffic noise over time and lower traffic volumes across the network predicted into the future. The combined effect results in a similar magnitude of impact when compared to the standalone Proposed Scheme.

10.32. Section 9.4.4.1.2.1 of Chapter 9 (Noise & Vibration) of the EIAR notes that traffic noise levels along the surrounding road network, will be lower than those assumed for the impact assessment due to lower noise emissions from the future fleet of electric vehicles along urban and suburban roads with lower speeds, particularly those along residential streets and roads. In reality, the impacts determined and presented for both years will be further reduced when the lower noise emissions associated with electric fleet along low speed roads are factored in.

#### Biodiversity

10.33. Cumulative impacts to biodiversity relate to habitat loss, disturbance and loss of foraging and habitat fragmentation. It is important to note given the location of the Proposed Scheme and the on-going urban development trends across Dublin, there is likely to be continued habitat loss and fragmentation in the area. The applicant however has had regard to the environmental protective policies of the relevant development plan for the scheme and the scheme is compliant with same.

10.33.1. I have already concluded within in-combination assessment carried out under the Appropriate Assessment in Section 7 of this planning report that there is no potential for adverse effects on the integrity of any European sites, to arise as a consequence of the Proposed Scheme in combination with any other plans or projects. I note that impacts on biodiversity will be no higher than the already predicted significant residual effects at the local geographic scale for the Proposed Scheme alone.

- 10.33.2. Disturbance or displacement impacts to mammals during construction will be temporary or short-term and are not likely to have long-term population level effects, or cumulatively with any future projects that might be proposed.

#### Archaeology and Built Heritage

- 10.33.3. I note that archaeological investigations will take place in order to identify any below-ground remains that may be present. This is true of all permitted significant infrastructure in the area and no significant cumulative effect on below-ground remains is anticipated. In terms of built heritage, no significant effects are expected, and mitigation measures will ensure the appropriate protection of features such as such as boundaries, street furniture, paving and surface treatments.

#### Landscape and Visual

- 10.34. It is stated within the EIAR that there will be potential for localised significant temporary/ short-term cumulative construction effects for the Proposed Scheme during construction in conjunction with other Major Projects, where concurrent construction of schemes have the potential to overlap. As set out in Section 21.2.6 of the EIAR, there is a likelihood of significant negative traffic related impacts should all 12 Core Bus Corridor schemes be constructed at the same time. The mitigation for this will be to programme the Construction Phases of the Core Bus Corridor schemes (assuming they are consented) so that the four schemes identified in proximity will not be constructed concurrently with adjoining schemes. In this regard, scheme construction programming will be controlled and implemented by the NTA. It is acknowledged that the effects would be reduced or negligible if the construction of these schemes does not overlap.
- 10.34.1. For the remaining shortlisted projects, should the construction periods either overlap or follow on within a short timeframe with the Proposed Scheme, there is potential for localised, moderate, temporary in-combination indirect townscape/ visual effects to occur. Effects would also be reduced or negligible if the construction of these schemes does not overlap and, in most cases, the potential impacts are

likely to be localised and contained, due to enclosing effect of the surrounding built form.

10.34.2. The construction phase will have impacts on a number of local amenities and open spaces, which have an interaction with population and human health. Access will be maintained to the open spaces and reinstated at the end of the Construction Phase, with replacement/set back boundary fences, footpaths, and replacement and new tree planting.

10.34.3. Having regard to the very detailed information provided by the applicant in relation to cumulative effects, I am satisfied that no significant cumulative effects arise in this instance.

#### Interactions

10.35. I have considered the interrelationships between factors and whether these may as a whole affect the environment, even though the effects may be acceptable when considered on an individual basis.

10.36. I consider that there is potential for population and human health to interact with all of the other factors (biodiversity, water, air and climate, noise, landscape and visual, cultural heritage and material assets – traffic). The details of all other interrelationships are set out in Chapter 21 of the EIAR which I have considered.

10.37. The proposed construction phase of the development has the most potential to interact with human health and biodiversity in relation to water contamination. Spills to waterbodies of hydrocarbons, concrete wash or other chemicals can have a direct effect on human health and biodiversity. It is important to note therefore that residual impacts to water were expected to be imperceptible and as such there is no likely significant interaction between Water and Human Health or Water and Biodiversity from this Proposed Scheme during construction.

10.38. Similarly human health and biodiversity can interact with air quality, noise and vibration and traffic. No significant impacts are expected in this regard and I am satisfied on the basis of the information provided that there is no likely significant interaction between these factors and human health.

- 10.38.1. I am satisfied that the proposals for the other 11 Core Bus Corridor schemes and the Proposed Scheme are complementary and could have a cumulative beneficial effect by encouraging active travel and increased use of public transport through offering a choice of routes. Due to the substantial size of overall population with the opportunity to benefit from the proposals, the effect is assessed as Positive, Very Significant and Long-Term for health.
- 10.39. Interactions between soils and water will arise but as mentioned above due to mitigation will not give rise to significant interaction. Similarly, interactions between water traffic and transport, however, all changes in traffic flows would occur within the same drainage catchments and so there would be no significant impacts from this interaction.
- 10.40. Interactions also occur between Landscape (Townscape) and Visual, Architectural Heritage, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage. The Construction Phase will have impacts on a number of local features of heritage value, e.g., Protected Structures, Conservation Areas, Historic Mileposts etc. Excavations may interact with archaeology, but this would be restricted to the construction phase of the development. A number of trees are to be removed as part of the scheme; however, in the main such works will be temporary in that trees will be replanted. Temporary habitat loss as a result of construction could affect local fauna populations (the small area of amenity grassland at Construction Compound K2 is not considered suitable to support local fauna) but is not likely to have long-term population level effects. Although this is not considered a significant effect, with regards the Proposed Scheme in isolation, if other large infrastructure projects, which resulted in the same type of impacts, were constructed concurrently potential cumulative impacts could arise. It is possible that suitable breeding bird habitat will also be lost temporarily during construction. The environs of the River Poddle and Grand Canal are likely to be unsuitable for local populations of otter and bird species at least temporarily during construction as a result of disturbance impacts associated with the provision of the Stone Boat Boardwalk and cycle / pedestrian bridges alongside the Robert Emmett Bridge. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the temporary loss of suitable habitat and / or disturbance related impacts

on local fauna is not deemed to have a significant impact at any geographical scale, even cumulatively. Having regard to the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant I am satisfied that significant interactions will not arise.

10.41. I am also satisfied that effects as a result of interactions, indirect and cumulative effects can be avoided, managed and / or mitigated for the most part by the measures which form part of the proposed development, the proposed mitigation measures detailed in the EIAR, and with suitable conditions.

### **Reasoned Conclusion**

10.42. Having regard to the examination of environmental information contained above, to the EIAR and supplementary information provided by the applicant and the submissions from the planning authority's, prescribed bodies, and observers in the course of the application, it is considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are:

- Positive long-term impacts on **population and human health** through facilitation of improved pedestrian and cyclist safety, faster and more reliable bus services, reduced traffic congestion, improved air quality and noise reduction, improved road/street safety, improved connectivity and accessibility and amenity impacts for community areas.
- Benefits/positive impacts from the delivery of infrastructure that will enable the functioning of an efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service, which supports the achievement of Ireland's emission reduction targets. In this regard, the proposed scheme will make a significant contribution to reduction in **carbon emissions**. During construction impacts arising from embodied carbon of construction materials will have a negative significant impact in the short term but will be necessary to deliver long term benefits in reducing emissions in the transport sector.
- Potential for **water quality** impacts from surface water runoff during construction containing fine sediments, accidental spillages/ leakages, and disruption of local drainage networks. Adequate mitigation measures for



surface water management are contained within the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

- Negative impacts on **biodiversity** relate to the removal of habitat in the form of hedgerows and treelines. Such impacts are not considered significant and can adequately be mitigated for within the scheme. Vegetation will be planted in the vicinity to bolster existing treelines and hedgerow. Significant impacts are therefore not expected in this regard. The avoidance of trees with roosting potential for bats, use of bat boxes, and the maintenance of commuting corridors, as well as preconstruction bat surveys will ensure significant impacts to bats are avoided. Pre-construction surveys will ensure that no mammals, birds or invasive species are present within the works areas. Adequate mitigation measures are proposed to ensure the protection of such mammals and birds encountered and to prevent the spread of invasive species. Significant impacts to biodiversity can therefore be ruled out.
- **Noise and Dust** impacts arise during the construction phase from construction activities. These impacts will be mitigated through adherence to best practice construction measures in relation to dust and the use of noise abatement at sensitive locations. Significant noise impacts arise in relation to construction noise during nighttime and weekend hours when thresholds are lower. Works will generally be carried out in daytime hours causing no significant effects. In the event that works are required during nighttime or weekend hours, liaison with residents in this regard and the use of noise abatement will reduce the level of impacts. Noise disturbance from the operation of the development can be ruled out, electric bus fleet and less cars will have a positive impact on operational noise. Post mitigation significant impacts arising from noise and dust disturbance during the construction, operational and decommissioning stages can therefore be ruled out.
- Negative short-term **traffic** impacts arise during the construction phase of the development, these impacts will be mitigated through the implementation of a

traffic management plan and a construction management plan. Whilst some localised impacts arising from road closures may arise, significant impacts arising from traffic can be ruled out during construction stage. Significant positive impacts will arise for people movement on sustainable and active travel modes in the operational phase.

10.43. The EIAR has considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment would be primarily mitigated by environmental management measures, as appropriate. Thus, having regard to the foregoing assessment, I am, therefore, satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct or indirect effects on the environment.

10.44. The EIAR has considered that the main significant direct and indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the receiving environment. Following mitigation, no residual significant long-term negative impacts on the environment or sensitive receptors would occur. I am satisfied that the information provided is reasonable and sufficient to allow the Board to reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the project on the environment, taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment. Overall, I am satisfied that the information contained in the EIAR complies with the provisions of Article 3, 5 and Annex (IV) of EU Directive 2014/52/EU.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

11.1. I recommend that permission is granted subject to the following conditions.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

In coming to its decision, the Board had regard to the following:

**European legislation**, including of particular relevance:

- The relevant provisions of European Union Directive 2014/52/EU amending Directive 2011/92/EU (Environmental Impact Assessment Directive) on the

assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, and

- Directive 92/43/EEC (Habitats Directive) and Directive 79/409/EEC as amended by 2009/147/EC (Birds Directives) which set the requirements for Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora throughout the European Union.

**National and regional planning and related policy, including:**

- Climate Action Plan 2024,
- National Biodiversity Action Plan 2017-2021,
- Project Ireland 2040 encompassing the National Planning Framework and the National Development Plan 2021-2030,
- Smarter Travel – A Sustainable Transport Future: A New Transport Policy for Ireland 2009 – 2020,
- Department of Transport National Sustainable Mobility Policy, 2022,
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019,
- Cycle Design Manual (NTA & DoT 2023), and
- Other relevant guidance documents.

**Regional and local level policy, including the:**

- Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2019-2031,
- Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022-2042,
- Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028,
- Dublin City Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2025,
- Other relevant policy and guidance documents,

**And the following:**

- Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028,

- the nature, scale and design of the proposed development, as set out in the planning application, and the pattern of development in the vicinity,
- the entirety of the documentation submitted by the National Transport Authority (NTA) (applicant) in support of the proposed development, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and the Natura Impact Statement (NIS), and the range of mitigation and monitoring measures proposed,
- the submissions made to An Bord Pleanála in connection with the planning application,
- the likely consequences for the environment and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area in which it is proposed to carry out the proposed development and the likely significant effects of the proposed development on European Sites, and
- the report and recommendation of the Inspector, including the examination, analysis and evaluation undertaken in relation to appropriate assessment (AA) and environmental impact assessment (EIA).

**12.1.** It is considered that the proposed development would accord with European, national, regional and local planning and that it is acceptable in respect of its likely effects on the environment and its likely consequences for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

#### **Appropriate Assessment Stage 1:**

The Board agreed with and adopted the screening assessment and conclusion carried out in the inspector's report that the following sites are the European sites for which there is a likelihood of significant effects:

- North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000206),
- South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000210),
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 003000),
- Howth Head Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000202),

- Wicklow Mountains Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 002122),
- Knocksink Wood Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000725),
- Ballyman Glen Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000713),
- Baldoyle Bay Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000199),
- Glenasmole Valley Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 001209),
- Rye Water Valley/Carton Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 001398),
- Ireland's Eye Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 002193),
- Malahide Estuary Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000205),
- Rogerstown Estuary Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000208)
- Lambay Island Special Area of Conservation (Site Code: 000204),
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004024),
- North Bull Island Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004006),
- Dalkey Islands Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004172),
- Wicklow Mountains Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004040),
- Baldoyle Bay Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004016),
- Howth Head Coast Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004113),
- Ireland's Eye Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004117),
- Malahide Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004025),
- Rogerstown Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004015),
- Lambay Island Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004069),
- The Murrough Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004186),
- Skerries Islands Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004122),
- Rockabill Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004014), and
- North-west Irish Sea Special Protection Area (Site Code: 004236).

## **Appropriate Assessment Stage 2:**

The Board considered the Natura Impact Statement and all other relevant submissions and carried out an appropriate assessment of the implications of the proposal for the European Sites, in view of the Sites' Conservation Objectives. The Board considered that the information before it was adequate to allow the carrying out of an appropriate assessment.

In completing the assessment, the Board considered, in particular, the likely direct and indirect impacts arising from the proposal both individually or in combination with other plans or projects, specifically upon the European Sites and the mitigation measures which are included as part of the current proposal in view of the conservation objectives for the European Sites.

The Board accepted and adopted the appropriate assessment carried out in the Inspector's report in respect of the potential effects of the proposed development on the integrity of the aforementioned European Sites, having regard to the Sites' conservation objectives.

In overall conclusion, the Board was satisfied that the proposed development, by itself or in combination with other plans or projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of the European Sites, in view of the Sites' conservation objectives and there is no reasonable scientific doubt as to the absence of such effects.

## **Environment Impact Assessment**

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment of the proposed development, taking into account:

- the nature, scale, location, and extent of the proposed development.
- the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and associated documentation submitted with the application.
- the submissions received during the course of the application; and
- the Inspector's report.

The Board considered that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, supported by the documentation submitted by the applicant, adequately considers alternatives to the proposed development and identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment. The Board agreed with the examination, set out in the Inspector's report, of the information contained in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and associated documentation submitted by the applicant and submissions made in the course of the planning application.

### **Reasoned Conclusion for EIA**

The Board considered that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, supported by the documentation submitted by the applicant, provided information which is reasonable and sufficient to allow the Board to reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment, taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment. The Board is satisfied that the information contained in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report is up to date and complies with the provisions of EU Directive 2014/52/EU amending Directive 2011/92/EU. The Board considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are those arising from the impacts listed below.

The main significant effects, both positive and negative, are:

- Positive long-term impacts on **population and human health** through facilitation of improved pedestrian and cyclist safety, faster and more reliable bus services, reduced traffic congestion, improved air quality and noise reduction, improved road/street safety, improved connectivity and accessibility and amenity impacts for community areas.
- Benefits/positive impacts from the delivery of infrastructure that will enable the functioning of an efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service, which supports the achievement of Ireland's emission reduction targets. In this regard, the proposed scheme will make a significant

contribution to reduction in **carbon emissions**. During construction impacts arising from embodied carbon of construction materials will have a negative significant impact in the short term but will be necessary to deliver long term benefits in reducing emissions in the transport sector.

- Potential for **water quality** impacts from surface water runoff during construction containing fine sediments, accidental spillages/ leakages, and disruption of local drainage networks. Adequate mitigation measures for surface water management are contained within the Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- Negative impacts on **biodiversity** relate to the removal of habitat in the form of hedgerows and treelines. Such impacts are not considered significant and can adequately be mitigated for within the scheme. Vegetation will be planted in the vicinity to bolster existing treelines and hedgerow. Significant impacts are therefore not expected in this regard. The avoidance of trees with roosting potential for bats, use of bat boxes, and the maintenance of commuting corridors, as well as preconstruction bat surveys will ensure significant impacts to bats are avoided. Pre-construction surveys will ensure that no mammals, birds or invasive species are present within the works areas. Adequate mitigation measures are proposed to ensure the protection of such mammals and birds encountered and to prevent the spread of invasive species. Significant impacts to biodiversity can therefore be ruled out.
- **Noise and Dust** impacts arise during the construction phase from construction activities. These impacts will be mitigated through adherence to best practice construction measures in relation to dust and the use of noise abatement at sensitive locations. Significant noise impacts arise in relation to construction noise during nighttime and weekend hours when thresholds are lower. Works will generally be carried out in daytime hours causing no significant effects. In the event that works are required during nighttime or weekend hours, liaison with residents in this regard and the use of noise abatement will reduce the level of impacts. Noise disturbance from the operation of the development can



be ruled out, electric bus fleet and less cars will have a positive impact on operational noise. Post mitigation significant impacts arising from noise and dust disturbance during the construction, operational and decommissioning stages can therefore be ruled out.

- Negative short-term **traffic** impacts arise during the construction phase of the development, these impacts will be mitigated through the implementation of a traffic management plan and a construction management plan. Whilst some localised impacts arising from road closures may arise, significant impacts arising from traffic can be ruled out during construction stage. Significant positive impacts will arise for people movement on sustainable and active travel modes in the operational phase.
- The EIAR has considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment would be primarily mitigated by environmental management measures, as appropriate.
- The EIAR has considered that the main significant direct and indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the receiving environment. Following mitigation, no residual significant long-term negative impacts on the environment or sensitive receptors would occur.

Having regard to the above, the Board is satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct or indirect effects on the environment. The Board is satisfied that the reasoned conclusion is up to date at the time of making the decision and that the information contained in the EIAR complies with the provisions of Article 3, 5 and Annex (IV) of EU Directive 2014/52/EU.

### **Proper Planning and Sustainable Development**

The proposed road development would deliver a key component of the National Transport Authority's BusConnects programme with the stated aim to improve bus services across the country. It would also provide safer infrastructure for pedestrians

and cyclists and would deliver sustainable connectivity and integration with other transport services. The public realm along the bus corridor would also be improved. The Board considered that the proposed road development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would be in accordance with national, regional and local planning policies, including multiple policies and objectives set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and having regard to all relevant provisions, including zoning objectives, at or adjoining the overall scheme area. It is further considered that the need, justification and purpose of the proposed road development has been adequately demonstrated, that it is acceptable in terms of its likely effects on the environment and that an approval for the proposed road development would be consistent with national climate ambitions and with the relevant provisions of the Climate Action Plan 2024 through the delivery of an efficient, low carbon and climate resilient public transport service, which supports the achievement of Ireland's emission reduction targets. The proposed road development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 13.0 Conditions

1. The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. The mitigation measures and environmental commitments contained in the submitted Natura Impact Statement shall be implemented in full as part of the proposed development.

**Reason:** To protect the integrity of European Sites.

3. The mitigation measures and environmental commitments measures contained in the submitted Environmental Impact Assessment Report shall be implemented.

**Reason:** To protect the environment.

4. Prior to commencement of development, the developer, and/or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare in consultation with the relevant statutory agencies, an updated Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating all mitigation measures indicated in the Natura Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Assessment Report and a demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols.

The updated CEMP shall also include details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, compound/works area lighting, noise management measures and surface water management proposals.

The construction of the development shall be constructed in accordance with the updated CEMP.

**Reason:** In the interests of protecting the environment, the landscape, the integrity of European Sites and sensitive receptors and in the interest of public health.

5. In accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, a suitably experienced and qualified ecologist will be appointed by the contractor. The ecologist will advise the contractor on ecological matters during construction, communicate all matters in a timely manner to the developer (National Transport Authority) and statutory authorities as appropriate, acquire any licences/ consents required to conduct the work, and supervise and direct the ecological measures associated with the permitted scheme. Where appropriate, monitoring shall be undertaken by specialists. Monitoring schedules shall be included in Site Specific Habitats Protection and Re-instatement Method Statements.

**Reason:** In the interest of environmental protection.

6. (a) Trees to be felled shall be examined prior to felling and demolition to determine the presence of bat roosts. Any clearance works shall be in accordance with the Transport Infrastructure Ireland Guidelines for the Treatment of Bats During the Construction of National Road Schemes.

(b) No ground clearance shall be undertaken and no vegetation shall be cleared from the 1st day of March to 31st day of August, unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of protection and enhancing local biodiversity.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit an Invasive Species Management Plan to the planning authority, which includes details of a pre-construction survey to be carried out. The plan shall include full details of the eradication of such invasive species from the development site prior to construction or if discovered during construction as soon as is practicably possible.

**Reason:** In the interests of nature conservation and mitigating ecological damage associated with the development.

8. Prior to the commencement of any works associated with the development hereby permitted, the developer shall submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan and a Construction Stage Mobility Management Plan for the construction phase of the development for the written agreement of the planning authority. The Construction Stage Mobility Management Plan shall promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking by personnel accessing and working on the construction site. The agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Stage Mobility Management Plan shall be implemented in full during the course of construction of the development.

**Reason:** In the interest of traffic safety and promoting sustainable travel during the construction period.

9. The developer shall monitor queuing time/ delays at each works location and record traffic flows on the local road network at locations to be agreed with the planning authority. Such monitoring information shall be provided in a report to the planning authority on a weekly basis.

**Reason:** In the interest of orderly development.

10. Prior to the commencement of any works associated with the development hereby permitted, the developer shall submit a plan for an upgraded pedestrian crossing

with a raised platform which would operate as a “courtesy crossing” as described in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS), to be located to the south western corner of Harolds Cross Park, where the short link road joins Kimmage Road Lower, at the entrance to the Park, to be carried out during the construction phase of the development, for the written agreement of the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of traffic safety and promoting sustainable travel.

11. Prior to the commencement of any works associated with the development hereby permitted, the developer shall submit a plan for planter boxes instead of bollards on Derravaragh Road at (I) Corrib Road, (II) Neagh Road & Aideen Drive and (III) Mount Tallant Avenue, to be carried out at the construction phase of the development, for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Derravaragh Road at Corrib Road, Neagh Road and Mount Tallant Avenue

**Reason:** In the interest of landscaping, visual amenity and urban realm.

12. In accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, all works to protected structures, and structures of cultural heritage interest shall be monitored and recorded by an Architectural Conservation Specialist, Re instatement Method Statements shall be submitted to the planning authority to be held on file. The Architectural Conservation Specialist shall ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the proposed works and across all preparatory and construction phases. Any features of new architectural heritage shall be made known to the Conservation Section of the planning authority as soon as is practicably possible.

**Reason:** In the interest of environmental protection.

13. The developer shall facilitate the preservation, recording and protection of archaeological materials or features that may exist within the site. In this regard, the developer shall –

- a) employ a suitably qualified archaeologist who shall monitor all site investigations and other excavation works, and
- b) provide arrangements, acceptable to the planning authority, for the recording and for the removal of any archaeological material which the authority considers appropriate to remove. In default of agreement on any of these requirements, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

All archaeological pre-construction investigations shall be carried out in accordance with the details specified within the Environmental Impact Assessment Report submitted with the application.

**Reason:** In order to conserve the archaeological heritage of the site and to secure the preservation and protection of any remains that may exist within the site.

14. Noise monitoring shall be carried out during the construction phase of the proposed road development by the developer to ensure that construction noise threshold levels ( $L_{Aeq}$ , period) shall not exceed the levels set out in Table 9.8 (Construction Noise Threshold (CNT) levels for the Proposed Scheme) of Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report. During the construction phase, noise monitoring shall be carried out at representative noise sensitive locations to be agreed with the planning authority as the work progresses along the scheme to evaluate and inform the requirement and/ or implementation of noise management measures. Noise monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with ISO 1996–1 (ISO 2016) and ISO 1996–2 (ISO 2017).

**Reason:** In the interest of management of construction noise and protection of adjoining amenities.

15. Prior to the replacement of trees, hedging and planting which is to be removed the National Transport Authority shall liaise with the relevant landowner with regard to the species, size and location of all replacement vegetation. Tree protection measures for all existing trees shall be put in place prior to commencement of development or phases of development and all details of soft landscaping shall be submitted to the planning authority for agreement prior to implementation. The National Transport Authority shall also employ the services of an appropriately qualified arboriculturist and Landscape Architect to advise on landscaping and tree works.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual and residential amenity and protection of biodiversity.

16. (a) Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works in respect of both the construction and operation phases of the proposed development.

(b) Any new or improved surface water outfalls shall be constructed in a manner which protects riparian habitat and does not result in excessive erosion of such habitat.

**Reason:** In the interests of environmental protection and public health.

17. Comprehensive details of the proposed public lighting system to serve the proposed scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interests of public safety and visual amenity.



18. Prior to commencement of development, the finalised location and type of cycle parking stands throughout the scheme shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority.

**Reason:** In the interest of facilitating convenient and adequate bicycle parking.

19. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall agree in writing with the planning authority details of the precise design and layout of pedestrian crossing facilities over cycle tracks at island bus stops on a case-by-case basis which shall be informed by the Cycle Design Manual (National Transport Authority, September 2023).

**Reason:** In the interest of pedestrian and cyclist safety.

20. Scaled elevations of proposed bus shelters to be provided throughout the route shall be submitted for the written agreement of the relevant Planning Authority.

**Reason:** In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development, conservation of the visual amenities and character of the area and preservation of conservation streetscape.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Fiona Fair  
Senior Planning Inspector

17.02.2025

## **Appendix 1**

### **1. Ann O'Connell (52 Derravaragh Road, Terenure)**

- Concerns from residents of Derravaragh Road and Corrib Road, signed by 6 residents.
- Concern of set of bollards at junction of Derravaragh and Corrib Roads which will block easy access to Terenure village.
- Concern of traffic congestion on Kimmage Road.
- A turning restriction would be more appropriate to retain access for locals.
- Concern bollards are unsightly and unnecessary.
- If bollards are permitted they should comprise planter boxes and this should be repeated at the Derravaragh / Aideen junction.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

### **2. Anna Rackard (91 Corrib Road)**

- Same concerns as expressed above at submission NO. 1
- Concern of impact upon Sundrive road / Larkfield traffic lights.
- Concern of congestion on Corrib Road.
- Traffic management measures such as road restrictions at certain times of the day would be more effective way of diverting traffic from using Hazelbrook Road / Corrib Road / Derravaragh Road.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

### **3. Anne O’Flaherty, 28 Greenmount Close**

- Concern of noise pollution.
- Concern of impact upon health of residents – air pollution.
- Concern of loss of bus stop close to residence.
- Road widening will bring noise and traffic closer to residences.

### **4. Brendan Heneghan**

- **Request that an OH be held**
- Concern of implementation of 4 bus gates
- Concern of hours of operation of bus gates and bus corridor.
- Concern traffic analysis and projections stack up.
- Concern inadequate projection for cyclists
- Concern of consultation process and requirements of Aarhus Convention and in particular Kazakhstan advice related to pandemic conditions.
- Concern of procedural issues incl. failure to place notices as agreed and failure to place all documents on the public file.
- Concern of traffic displacement to residential streets.
- Negative impact upon villages, in particular, Kimmage village.
- Concern of congestion and longer trips for locals and residents.
- Concern of proposals for tree planting at Corrib Road.
- Concern of CPO of lands opposite the Hospice.
- Concern of access to Mount Jerome Cemetery.
- Concern of loss of left turn slip at KCR
- Concern of dangerous right hand turns at Fortfield Road
- Concern of impact upon historic walls at Emmet Bridge.
- Concern of impact upon the Poddle River.
- Concern that the NTA funded certain individuals to get consultants expert opinion / professional advice in respect to the proposed Charlemont Station development.
- Issues of general application covered in other submissions on other CBC Routes.
- Concern of contravention of statutory plans.
- Concern of necessity of the scheme.

- Accompanied with appendices relating to an internal review request on FOI 2023-0134 -Kimmage Corridor.
- Accompanied with Gmail's sent to self, recording bus trip details.
- Accompanied with newspaper clippings referring to Buccconnects.
- Concern inaccurate and unreliable information used in analysis.
- Accompanied with photographs.
- Concern excessive use of busgates, disproportionate.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Unhappy no OH was granted.
- Concern NTA response fails to deal with issues raised.
- The NTA have not accepted a single point made by members of the public.
- Concern of use of bus gates and in particular Busgate No. 1, it should be removed as it is unnecessary, or hours of use restricted.
- No new issues raised.

#### **5. Caitriona Dempsey, 1 Mount Argus Square.**

- Concern of proposed cycle path from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Square / estate.
- Concern of antisocial behaviour, safety and security issues.
- Concern cycleway is unnecessary.
- Loss of cultural heritage.
- Lack of consultation and analysis of where cycle paths in enclosed estates work for the communities.
- Concern of increased speed of bicycles.
- Concern of loss of biodiversity from new cycle connections.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern of increased risk for security and anti-social behaviour, due to proposed removal of a wall linking Mount Argus with Sundrive road for cyclists.
- No new issues raised.

**6. Capital Glass Company Ltd. (61A & 62 Lower Clanbrassil Street)**

- Concern of impact to long established glass business.
- The business gets weekly collections by large trucks to recycle broken glass.
- Concern of lack of consultation.
- Concern skip use will be impeded.
- Concern business will be severely impacted.
- Concern community based shop will be severely affected.

**7. Carol Michael, 23 Greenmount Close, HCR**

- Concern of noise pollution.
- Concern of impact upon health of residents – air pollution.
- Concern of loss of bus stop close to residence.
- Road widening will bring noise and traffic closer to residences.

**8. Ciaran Coffey (436 Clonard Road)**

- Concern of closure of Ravensdale Park and Poddle Park to vehicular traffic.
- Increased traffic on residential roads.
- Concern of traffic diversion and impact on the proposed cycleway.
- Safety concerns at Sundrive Road
- Social equity considerations – closure of road linking D12 and D6

**9. Cllr Anne Feeney City Hall**

- Support the development of more user friendly and environmentally sensitive transport solutions.
- Needs to be considered in conjunction with Templeogue / Rathfarnham bus connects scheme.
- Proposal needs to be considered in conjunction with Dublin City Council Development Plan, Volume of HGV's and cars diverted onto narrow residential

roads, local access for residents and small businesses, capacity of Guards to enforce bans along with other considerations.

- Query the justification and effectiveness of the proposal.
- Query the locations of the bus gates and their hours of operation.
- Bus gates on Kimmage Road Lower are unnecessary.
- Concern the proposal is over engineered.
- **Request that an OH be held.**

#### **10. Cllr Carolyn Moore, City Hall**

- Support for Bus Connects
- Integral part of the transport solution for Dublin
- Proposal accords with National, Regional and Local Policy.
- Delivers on commitments for Climate Change and delivers commitments set out in the Climate Action Plan.
- Acknowledge the public consultation held by the NTA and also the limitations due to Covid.
- Acknowledge concern of the quality and inclusiveness of the consultations which took place in 2020, with a lack of clear, accessible information from the NTA.
- Important placement and public realm is considered, esp. in Kimmage.
- Green roof designs should be considered.
- Pedestrian infrastructure should be improved and be in line with DMURS.
- Cycling infrastructure should be 24 hour, concern of gap in the infrastructure in Kimmage village.
- Need to reduce potential for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.
- Concern of cycle path widths proposed, which are less than 2m and 1.5m in some instances.
- Where road sharing is necessary the 30kph speed limit should be enforced.
- Imperative enforcement and monitoring of bus lanes, gates and new traffic measures is carried out.
- Important biodiversity is protected. Retention of mature trees is important.
- Concern of lack of cumulative traffic modelling.
- Concern of access for local residents to adjacent urban centres.
- Expedite the work needed to initiate camera based enforcement.

#### **11. Cllr Pat Dunne & Joan Collins TD and Others**

- Accompanied with a petition.
- In general support public transport improvements.
- Main concern of the restrictions to through traffic at the proposed Bus Gate No. 1 north of Ravensdale Junction
- Concern of displacement of traffic into residential areas of Crumlin / Kimmage.
- Concern the bus gate will turn Lorcan O'Toole Park and Stannaway Road into the main thoroughfare for vehicles travelling to Sundrive, Mount Argus and Mount Jerome and onwards to the canal.
- Concern of rat running on local roads.
- Call on ABP to request additional information on mitigation against increased through traffic.
- Call for a plebiscite to be carried out among the residents of Poddle Park at the junction with Ravensdale with respect to road closure.
- Creation of permeability from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus by removing part of a wall at the stone boat feature is welcomed.
- No changes should be made until the bus routes are operational.
- Resident engagement with the NTA and monitoring on an on-going basis is crucial, pre and post introduction of changes.

#### **12. Cllr. Punam Rane**

- Support the Bus Connects programme.
- Support residents fears of increased through traffic and congestion.
- Acknowledge the concern of residents to diverted traffic at Ravensdale Park.
- Concern of access for residents to services and difficulty accessing their houses.
- Concern of access to businesses.
- General wider concern about accessing Mount Argus Church and Mount Jerome Cemetery.
- **Request that an OH is held.**

#### **13. Colin Price & Aileen Price**

- Concern of access / Bus Gate at the junction of Ravensdale Park and Lower Kimmage Road.
- More flexibility needed at Ravensdale.
- Submit that the hours & days of operation of the Bus Gate should be reconsidered, 7 days a week would be problematic.
- Hours of operation should align with actual peak traffic. (7:00 – 9:30 & 16:00 – 19:00)
- Concern of loss of car parking on Kimmage Road Lower.
- Submit that the 52 parking spaces from no.'s 177 – 199 Kimmage Road Lower are privately owned, there has been no engagement with NTA regarding these spaces.

#### **14. Cornelia Rafferty (52e Mount Argus Road)**

- Concern of removal of footpath at the southern end of Harolds Cross Park.
- Concern removal of the footpath will impact and destabilise mature trees within Harolds Cross Park.
- Concern the proposal prioritises cars and traffic flow over pedestrians and is contrary to stated objectives and aims of the scheme and national guidelines.
- Concern of loss of historic kerbing and negative impact upon historic park.
- Proposal to remove the footpath is contrary to DMURS
- Concern proposal will hinder attempts to increase walking & cycling to schools.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

#### **15. Corrib Road Residents c/o Mary McCabe 85 Corrib Road**

- Concern of restriction of or interference with existing right of way on Derravaragh Rd. / Corrib Road.
- Concern of Kimmage Road Bus Gate and impact upon Corrib Road residents travelling towards KCR (No.'s 1 – 107 Corrib Road)



- Concern of impact of no right turn at Aideen Ave and Kimmage Road on residents of Corrib Road, allowance and special rights should be afforded to residents to make the right turn.
- Concern of impact upon local community shops at Junction of Corrib Road and Kimmage Road Lower.
- Concern of bus corridor operating times and days. Introduction of a bus gate 7.00 am to 8.00 pm is not practical.
- Signed petition attached.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern of restriction of Right of Way
- Concern of impact on connectivity and quality of life.
- Concern of timings of Bus Corridor hours enforcement.
- No new issues raised.

#### **16. Daniel Martin Apt 60, Grenville Place.**

- Concern of land take of two green areas to the front of Grenville Place, in the ownership of Ardcross Management Co. CLG
- Concern of location of a construction compound K3 on the lands.
- Concern of anti-social behaviour and security issues.
- Concern of impact upon access and fire escape from apartments.
- Concern plan to plant 4 large trees, in the green area, after the construction period will block light to windows of the apartments and overshadow.
- Concern trees to be planted are unsuitable.
- Photos attached to the submission.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- The NTA has failed to address concerns raised.
- Reiterates concern of fire escape from Grenville Place & Patricks Court Apartments.
- No new issues raised.

#### **17. Dawnlane Limited, 31 Clanbrassil Street Dublin 8**

- Concern Public Notice is inaccurate.
- Concern Environmental Impact Assessment is deficient, material assets fails to consider Dawnlane Limited which is a waste and scrap recovery business.
- Concern the works proposed are not adequately described or designed.
- Concern of the impact to 31 Upper Clanbrassil Street.
- Concern proposal is contrary to the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive.
- NIS cannot adequately assess effects as the scheme is not adequately designed.
- Concern proposal is contrary to Habitats Directive, in the absence of identification of effects.
- Concern information is flawed.
- The scheme does not identify likely effects on Dawnlane Limited lands or business.
- Concern of reference to hazardous waste and 'unacceptable material' as referred to in the public notice.
- Concern access to lands will be extinguished and impact upon property rights.
- Concern that the Board will engage appropriate specialists to consider the full range of impacts on noise, air emissions, surface and ground water as well as ecology.
- Concern of lack of detail incl. design, drawings, detailed plans, elevations, levels.
- **Request that an OH be held.**

#### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Response by McGuigan Solicitors LLP
- The NTA has failed to address concerns raised.
- Reiterates concern of SEA deficiencies, deficiencies on the CPO schedules, access restrictions, inadequate drawings and details of impact in respect of property and the need to engage specialist advisors.
- It is not possible to facilitate loading at Mullins Scrap and at the same time facilitate access to Gordons fuels.
- Proportionality of effect on Agnes Cassidy's business has not been demonstrated.
- The basis upon which the plans are being prepared are misconceived as the level of detail is not ever construed as being uniform across the scheme.
- The application should be deemed invalid.
- Attached with letter, from Rodney Cassidy, objecting to no OH being held.
- No new issues raised.

**18. Deirdre Pender, 33 HCR**

- Concern of front boundary wall being replaced.
- Concern land take from 33 HCR to 61 HCR is justified.
- Concern of interruption to bus routes.
- Concern of introduction of multiple bus gates.
- Concern of different operational times of bus gates.
- Concern of displacement of private car traffic to surrounding streets, in particular past schools.
- Concern of impact upon local businesses and local access
- Concern of impact upon local villages and communities.
- Concern of narrow footpaths and error on drawings showing loss of parking spaces at the Park close to Mount Jerome / Russian Orthodox Church and access to Mount Argus Road. There are currently no car parking spaces on the park side of the road.

- Concern of non continuous cycle paths.
- Consider the design of the footbridges could be more decorative.
- Concern of inadequate surface water drainage on HCR outside of the observers house, additional shores are required.
- Request that ample notice of all works are conveyed to residents, in advance of works commencing.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

#### **19. Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage - Development Applications Unit (DAU)**

- The National Monument Service (NMS) has reviewed the EIAR and is broadly in agreement with the findings in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage.
- 4 no. conditions with respect to archaeology are recommended, they relate to:
  - Mitigation measures set out in the EIAR
  - CEMP
  - Project Archaeologist to be appointed.
  - Archaeological monitoring and any investigation work / excavation required.

#### **20. Dr Nichola Walsh & Mr. Kealan McGuinness**

- Concern of plan to block access to Corrib Road from Derravaragh Road
- Concern of negative impact to residents of Corrib Road.
- Concern of longer journey time and congestion.
- Concern of limited access to Terenure Village.
- Concern of impact upon property prices.
- Preferable to restrict access on Terenure Road West.

#### **21. Dublin City Council**

- See prescribed bodies section of this report above for detailed summary of DCC observations.

## **22. Dublin Commuter Coalition**

- Support Busconnects project
- Project route requires redesign.
- Need for enforcement and cameras to ensure enforcement.
- Bus lanes and Bus gates should be operational 24/7 hours.
- Two stage crossings for pedestrians should be omitted.
- Pedestrians need to be prioritised and junctions need to be in compliance with DMURS.
- Concern sufficient segregation for cyclists is not provided at the following junctions:
  - Ravensdale Road / Kimmage Road Lower
  - Mount Argus View / Kimmage Road Lower
  - Harolds Cross Road / Kimmage Road Lower
- Concern of safety of bus stop design and width of bus stop islands.
- Cycle track running in front of bus shelters should not be permitted.
- Shared space for pedestrians and cyclists causes conflict and is of concern.
- Concern junctions are not in compliance with DMURS
  - Mount Argus View / Kimmage Road Lower
  - Harolds Cross Road / Kimmage Road Lower
  - Harolds Cross Road / Parkview Avenue
- Concern that cycle parking provision is not included in the proposal.
- Concern scheme lacks segregation of cyclists from motor traffic along Ravensdale Park, Kimmage Road Lower, Sundrive Road and Harolds Cross Road.

## **23. Dublin Cycling Campaign**

- Support for the scheme.
- **Request an OH**
- Needs to ensure that the needs of the large 'interested but concerned' cohort of cyclists are met to provide modal shift.

- Concern all works are compliant with universal design for cycling.
- Welcome design interventions such as provision of cycling facilities along the main CBC corridor, bus gates operational at peak times from KCR to Harolds Cross, provision of new canal bridges at Emmet Bridge, new bus stop by-passes along sections of Kimmage Road Lower, Harolds Cross Road and Clanbrassil Street, provision of segregated cycle tracks on Harolds Cross Road, addition of quiet way along the Poddle and through Mount Argus, removal of cycleway through Ravensdale Park, improved pedestrian and cycle facilities at the KCR junction and the removal of slip roads.
- Consideration needs to be given to cycle track widths – minimum 2.0m
- Concern of lower quality intermittent cycle lanes on the Lower Kimmage Road.
- Concern of removal of advisory cycle lanes and replacement with car parking spaces.
- Concern operational hours of the bus gate does not align with school closing times, bus gate should operate during the time periods when children are travelling to and from school.
- Filtered permeability is a welcomed approach.
- Quiet Street Treatment is welcomed.
- Dutch Guidance as per CROW Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic should be adhered to.
- Welcome the role out of 30 Kph speed limits.

#### **24. Eilish Kenna, Hazel park**

- Concern with respect to Bus Gate and bus commuting.
- Concern of circuitous routes and congestion.
- Concern bus journey more complicated and longer.
- Plans are confusing and poorly communicated.
- Ravensdale Bus Gate is a major inconvenience to residents
- Concern of loss of access to shops, services and amenities.

- Concern delivery trucks and bin collections have been adequately considered.

#### **25. Eilish O'Brien, Derravaragh Road**

- Concern of blocking off of Derravaragh Road and Corrib Road.
- Concern of set of bollards at junction of Derravaragh and Corrib Roads which will block easy access to Terenure village.
- Concern of lack of consultation with residents.
- Concern of €50 fee for submission.
- Proposed bollards will cause traffic bottleneck and congestion.
- Concern of delays to residents who travel to St. Vincents Hospital, Blackrock Clinic and Beacon Hospital and University College Hospital.
- Concern of traffic congestion on Kimmage Road.
- A turning restriction would be more appropriate to retain access for locals.
- Require road access to take elderly parents to hospital appointments
- Concern bollards are unnecessary and will add significantly to journey times.
- Request that bollards are not permitted. Turning restrictions at specific times could be considered as an alternative.

#### **26. Eoin Duggan, 7 Mount Argus View**

- Concern of proposed cycle lane from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Estate.
- Concern of removal of walls at Mount Argus to facilitate cycle path.
- Question necessity of the new proposed cycle path
- Lack of consideration of past experience with respect to security issues, and community spirit and safety.
- Concern of increase in anti-social behaviour.
- Concern of increased danger to cyclists due to severe bends in the design.

- Lack of consultation and evidence showing where cycle paths in enclosed estates work for the community
- Loss of biodiversity
- Loss of cultural heritage, impact of boardwalk upon stone boat feature

**27. Estrella Vaquero, 44 Clanbrassil Street.**

- Concern with regard to location of bus stop No. 1290 placed at the front door of entrance at 2.7m @ 44 Clanbrassil Street.
- Concern at NTA proposal to initially move the bus stop further up the street, in 2019, and then change the proposed location.
- Concern of loss of privacy, security issues and antisocial behaviour.
- Concern of accidental claims against their property.
- Concern of blockage of access to property.
- Concern of noise and nuisance, vandalism and graffiti.
- Photographs attached.

**Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

**28. Gailot et Grey c/o Emma Grey, 59 Clanbrassil Street**

- Concern of loss of revenue
- Concern of increased traffic on adjacent streets.
- Safety Concerns
- Potential job losses.
- Consideration should be given to accommodating businesses:
  - Designated loading zones
  - Delivery windows
  - Logistics hubs
  - Pedestrianised zones



- Modern technology integration.
- Engagement with business community
- Signage and wayfinding
- Promote off peak deliveries.

**29. Gerard and Michelle Madden, 19 Mount Argus Court**

- Same points raised as those summarised above in submission No. 26 Eoin Duggan.

**30. Gill Ventures Ltd – Halal Food and Grocery, 60 / 60A Lower Clanbrassil Street**

- Concern of proposal for a 24 hour bus corridor on Clanbrassil Street.
- Lack of consultation with local businesses.
- Concern of impact upon accessibility of business.
- Concern of impact upon loading and unloading, safety issues.
- A survival option could be an unrestricted loading bay.

**31. Gordon's Fuels (Mr. Barra Gordon and Mrs Suzanne Gordon, 32A Clanbrassil Street Upper**

- Concerning Plot List 1022(1).1a Easement Plot List CE
- Concern to Plot List 1021(1)1c, 1021(2)1d, 1021(3)1z, 1021(4)2c, 1021(5)2d, 1021(6)2z. Easement Plot List CD
- Concerning 0.25 Ha (0.63 Acres) at Canbrassil Street Upper.
- The CPO involves demolishing a principle private residence and reduces accessibility to their business both during and after construction.
- Concern of impact upon future redevelopment potential of their property, which is zoned Z3, Neighbourhood zoned lands.
- The bridge widening works to facilitate new pedestrian and cycling structures require the removal of a gated access and separate roadway leading to their business.
- Concern of construction works impact on business.
- Concern of loss of on-street car parking spaces.
- Concern that future access requirements from Upper Clanbrassil Street and impact upon Z3 zoned lands has been appropriately considered.

- Request that ABP request additional information on the alternatives to the proposed bridge widening and new junction creation on Clanbrassil Street.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern no OH was held.
- Unhappy with NTA's response to issues raised.
- While the land take calculated at 5% may appear small the effect is much greater.
- If permitted the proposed scheme will cause considerable hardship to owners and operators of Gordon's Fuels.
- No new issues raised.

#### **32. Harolds Cross Tidy Towns Committee c/o Kieran Mullarkey, 5 Tivoli Avenue.**

- Welcome the aims and objectives of the Busconnects CBC
- Concern public realm is fully considered.
- Welcome public realm improvements at the junction of Sundrive Road with Lower Kimmage Road.
- Welcome public realm improvements at the junction of Ravensdale Park with Lower Kimmage Road.
- Request / suggest that cross community benefit be engage with to provide public seating and enhanced planting at Harolds Cross Bridge area – Robert Emmet Bridge – Grand Canal.
- Request the existing footpath to south side of Harolds Cross Park opposite 174 and 194 Harolds Cross Road, at the exit, should be retained and enhanced.
- Concern of loss of trees on east side of Harolds Cross Road, request that street tree planting is augmented rather than diminished.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been adequately addressed.
- Concern no OH was held.
- No new issues raised.

### **33. Hugh Kearns, 25 Moeran Road**

- Submit that the hours & days of operation of the Bus Gate should be reconsidered, 7 days a week would be problematic.
- Hours of operation should align with actual peak traffic.
- Concern of loss of car parking on Kimmage Road Lower.
- Submit that the 52 parking spaces from no.'s 177 – 199 Kimmage Road Lower are privately owned, there has been no engagement with NTA regarding these spaces.
- Concern of lack of comparative analysis of adjacent bus corridors.
- Concern of cycle route away from Kimmage Road Lower, through Ravensdale Park through Mount Argus estate, impactable, cyclists will not divert to a longer, slower winding route.

### **34. Hugh Raferty 79 Corrib Road.**

- Support for the project
- Half measures will limit the potential for success.
- Significant environmental benefits, cleaner air, reduced greenhouse emissions, reduced emissions, reduced congestion, improved physical health, improved mental health
- Wider benefits, i.e. expanded, more consistent, safe, improved, public transport network,
- Improved tourism potential, attractive and easy to navigate the city.
- Consequences of not implementing the project, public transport falls short, cycling environment hostile, decline in physical and mental health, restricted economic development, restricted foreign direct investment.

### **35. Irene and Eoin Lewis, 20 Corrib Road**

- Desirable to have a bus corridor.
- Concern of blocking off of Derravaragh Road and Corrib Road.

- Concern of set of bollards at junction of Derravaragh and Corrib Roads which will block easy access to shops.
- Concern of increased congestion.
- Concern of fire and emergency access / egress
- Proposed bollards will cause traffic bottleneck and congestion.
- Concern of traffic congestion on Kimmage Road.
- Concern bollards are unnecessary and will add significantly to journey times.

### **36. Isabella Walsh, 6 Mount Argus Way**

- Concern with regard to the proposed cycle path at Mount Argus.
- Concern of impact of boardwalk on biodiversity and cultural heritage, impact upon Stoneboat and conservation of Poddle River.
- Concern of impact of the proposed cycle path along the River Poddle and Mount Argus from a security perspective, safety and family needs.
- Concern of safety of children who are using the park from cyclists speeding through.
- Concern of cycle path alignment and dangerous bends.
- Raises the same points as raised within the submission from Eoin Duggan, submission summarised at No. 26 above.

### **37. Ivana Bacik**

- Support for the scheme, which represents a key step towards improving public transport and cycling infrastructure along this busy route.
- Supportive of plans for improved bus services, the increased provision of safe cycle lanes and active travel infrastructure.
- It is of great benefit generally to see plans for the development of a cleaner, quieter, more sustainable environment for everyone living and working in the area covered by this scheme.
- Support Increased frequency of buses, and reduced journey times on public transport.
- Supportive of the new pedestrian & cycle bridges on Emmet Bridge and the building of a new wall on the bridge.
- Plans to enhance safety at KCR are welcome.

- Concern public realm improvements have been reconsidered in favour of retaining car parking spaces in front of businesses, on lower Kimmage Road.
- Welcome the peak hour bus gates from Kimmage Cross Road to Harolds Cross.
- Concern with respect to the proposed Poddle Cycleway which now ends by joining Mount Argus View and exiting onto Lower Kimmage Road
- Note the comments of Dublin Cycling Campaign in respect to intermittent cycle lanes along Kimmage Road Lower.
- Concern with respect to width of cycle lanes, less than 2m
- Support the concern of St. Louis High School in Rathmines, with respect to route changes and loss of service.
- Concern of impact of construction on local communities, communication and liaison with DCC and local residents during the construction period.
- Concern for protection of biodiversity.
- Express concern about the level of fee required to make a submission on this consultation process.

### **38. James Purcell**

- Concern of impact of Bus Gates to residents of Kimmage Road Lower
- There is a need for residents to be allowed access through the Bus Gate, technology exists to afford this.
- Concern of raised pavement treatment plans and impact upon the laneway access to properties 128a, 128b, 128c, and 128e Lower Kimmage Road.
- Concern impact of cycle path on deliveries, waste collection and bins.
- Request that road markings and traffic signage for unencumbered access and egress to the lane between 128C and 130 Kimmage Road Lower are provided.
- Bus stop shelter at bus stop 2391, Priory Road is impractical due to narrow width of footpath.
- 30Kph speed limit on Kimmage Road Lower is not realistic or fuel efficient.

## **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Unnecessary proposed traffic island, positioned in front of 126 – 140 LKR, overbearing development, creates access difficulties and prohibits homeowners' potential to use EV's.
- No new issues raised.

**39. Jeff Kelly**

- Concern to the opening up of the Mount Argus Estate onto Sundrive Road for the proposed cycleway.
- Safety concerns for children, no segregation from the proposed cycle path and Mount Argus Square Apartments.
- Concern for safety of young and old from cyclists not stopping at lights and speeding.
- Query the need for the cycle path given the bus gate.
- Concern of anti-social behaviour in Mount Argus Park from opening up access and proposal for cycle path connectivity.
- Concern of impact to biodiversity of Mount Argus Park and Riiver Poddle.
- Concern of restrictions and bus priority at KCR
- Concern of loss of bus stops.
- Concern of loss of access to amenities, services and shops, esp. by elderly and not abled bodied.
- Concern of bus gates on Lower Kimmage Road
- Concern of impact upon archaeology and cultural heritage of the city.
- Query the need and necessity of the project in light of Covid and working from home.
- Concern cycle lanes are not wide enough and unsafe.

**40. Jim O'Brien, 52E Mount Argus Road**

- Concern public realm improvements have been watered down or abandoned.
- Concern of removal of public footpath along the southern edge of Harolds Cross Park.

- Concern of impact on trees within Harolds Cross park.
- Concern of impact to school children walking to school, crossing roads, unsafe.
- Concern proposal will hinder attempts to increase walking & cycling to schools.
- Concern the proposal prioritises cars and traffic flow over pedestrians and is contrary to stated objectives and aims of the scheme and national guidelines.
- Proposal to remove the footpath is contrary to DMURS
- Concern of removal of the cycle lane on the east side of Lower Kimmage Road.
- Concern of changes to Poddle Cycleway pushing cycling traffic onto the main road earlier.
- Request that the quiet street treatment for Mount Argus Road should be reinstated.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

#### **41. Kenilworth Park Residents' Association**

- Welcomes the principle aims and objectives of the project.
- Welcomes the reduction in traffic volumes, greater utilisation of public transport and a reduction in private traffic volumes in the locality.
- Concern of removal of proposal for No Left Turn from Sundrive Road to Lower Kimmage Road. This will have a fundamental knock on effect to the number of vehicles using LKR and to prevent through traffic from using Kenilworth Park instead of Clareville Road.
- No reason given for deviation / change from initial proposals namely EPR, PC2 and PC3 which provided for No Left Turn Except Buses Taxis and Bicycles.
- Concern of changes to the direction and length of the segregated cycle track ' The Poddle Cycleway'.
- Welcome the public realm improvements at junction of Sundrive Road with Lower Kimmage Road.
- Welcome the public realm improvements at junction of Ravensdale Park with Lower Kimmage Road.

- Concern for proposals to the historic Robert Emmet Bridge, unnecessary and will cause undue structural damage, priority signalling could be used instead.
- Enforcement will be necessary and vital to ensure the scheme is effective and workable.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern no OH held.
- No new issues raised.

#### **42. Larkview FC c/o Mark Caslin**

- Concern of the Bus Gate at the junction of Kimmage Road Lower and Ravensdale Road with no left turn between the hours of 6pm and 8pm.
- Concern of impact upon juvenile teams and access to the club.
- Concern one will not be able to access the club from the Harolds Cross side either via private transport.
- While the idea that more people could bus, cycle and walk it is not workable for everyone.
  - 70 coaches involved with the juvenile section of the club, it is not possible to carry equipment on a public bus or bicycle.
  - Cycling in the city is dangerous for small children and not recommended
  - Family commitments, dropping off and picking up multiple children will be hampered and unviable for families.
  - Not everyone lives on a busroute
- Concerned impact upon club will not be sustainable
- Request that the Bus Gate be relocated north of the club.
- Request technology is used to allow cars limited access.
- Concern cost to local community is too high to facilitate commuters
- Concern that without mitigation this proposal will diminish life for local citizens, which would be contrary to the DCC Development Plan Objectives.



- Concern survey data is out of date, given shift to working from home and cultural shift post covid.

#### **43. Larkfield Residents Association**

- Support and welcome the development of the bus network.
- Concern of indirect impact of diverted traffic to Larkfield Park.
- Concern of serious detrimental effect on the Larkfield Avenue / Larkfield Park / Clareville Road area.
- Concern of rat running, esp. impact upon local schools.
- Concern of safety from additional traffic and speed, the area has a significant population of elderly and young children.
- Concern of prioritising through traffic along a settled residential road.

#### **44. Legal Estate of Residents of Agnes Cassidy c/o Rodney Cassidy**

- Concern to property located at 31 Clanbrassil Street.
- **Request that an OH be held**

#### **45. Liam Smyth, Kimmage Grove**

- In agreement with the proposal subject to observations.
- Need to relocate existing telephone / light / sign poles which are poorly located and block pedestrian path. Suggest that a survey is carried out.
- More new trees should be planted to increase tree provision in the city.
- There is an opportunity to provide high quality amenity space to Sundrive Road / Lower Kimmage Road junction and surround.
- High quality palette of paving should be used.
- A more ambitious planting / landscaping / street furniture plan is required.

#### **46. Linda Patton, 6 Rathdown Court**

- Opposed to the project.
- Concern of cumulative impact of the project with adjoining Templeogue / Rathfarnham Bus connects and Tallaght / Clondalkin to city centre Bus connects projects.

- Concern of negative impact to urban villages, local businesses and communities.
- Concern of impact of Bus Gates on local residents.
- No evidence restrictions are needed at weekends.
- Concern of clarity of maps.
- Concern of circuitous routes for car journeys which cannot be done by public transport.
- Concern that public consultation process meets Aarhus Convention obligations.
- Concern all 12 Bus Connects routes have been considered separately.
- Concern of project splitting and in-combination effects not assessed in the EIA.
- Concern up to date traffic modelling and counts have not been used.
- Cumulative impact upon nature conservation is required, in particular Bat population.
- **Request that an OH is held.**

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been addressed.
- No new issues raised.

#### **47. Lisa Harrington, 37 HCR, Dublin 6W**

- Concern that front boundary (iron railing and low stone wall) will be reinstated to a condition comparable to existing if not improved.
- Concern of impact upon 3 mature apple trees in the front garden, 2 of which are located in an area to be temporarily acquired.
- Concern of impact upon mature privet hedge.
- Impact upon a retaining wall to support the lawn area in the front garden.
- Concern rose bushes, concrete path and steps leading to the front door will not be damages.
- Seek confirmation that drainage will be adequate.
- Request consultation on design.

#### **48. Lower Kimmage Road Residents Association (LOKRA)**

- Broad support for the proposal.
- Accept altered access and egress arrangements with on-going monitoring of impacts and potential for a vastly improved bus service, without road widening.
- Submit neighbours on adjoining roads will share proportions of redistributed traffic which residents on Kimmage Road Lower have borne for decades and which in current volumes and speeds is no longer sustainable.
- Submit cautious support and welcome benefits of a cleaner, quieter, safer road and living environment.
- Request that consideration be given to the operation times of the Bus Gates to include school pick up times.
- Support 30Kph speed limit on KRL
- Requests the reinstatement of the No left turn at Sundrive Cross onto KRL from Sundrive Road.
- Welcomes the upgrades for bus stops but queries practicality of providing shelter and seating at all bus stops. Concern expressed with regard to bus stops 2440 (Aideen Ave), 2391 (Priory Road) and 2390 (Kenilworth Park) on narrow sections of path.
- Welcomes improvement to junctions
- Welcome 2 m wide footpath commitment.
- Concern of reduced footpath at the southern end of Harolds Cross Park.
- Welcomes enhanced cycling provision.
- Supports the reduction in speed limits.
- Strongly supports improvements to public realm.
- Concern public realm at Sundrive Road crossroads at KRL, noted as the 'village centre' is not enhanced in the scheme.
- Concern parking spaces are favoured over pedestrians and cyclists at 169 – 199 LKR to facilitate businesses. Contrary to policy.
- Concern removal of trees to provide car parking is unacceptable.
- EV Charging infrastructure should be provided.
- Evaluation of utilities and wiring should be carried out to improve visual impact.

- Concern of land take from homes, particularly gardens of 33 to 61 and St. Clare's School and the CPO of a private dwelling at Fottrell House offices at Emmett Bridge.
- Residents whose homes are directly beside bus gates should be provided with alternative and appropriate parking spaces.
- Concern for loss of car parking for residents on KRL / Sundrive Road Junction
- Contest the assertion that most residential properties have off-street parking at the rear.
- Concern for proposals to Robet Emmet Bridge and advocate for a different approach.
- Concern for protection of Harolds Cross Park and Mount Jerome cluster of protected structures.
- Concern for direct impact on architectural heritage of KRL
- Consider Park & Ride is critical for success of the project.
- Submit enforcement and signage is critical to success of the project.
- Monitoring and on-going community engagement is required.
- Errors in the documentation with respect to right of way notices, discrepancies in the indicated bus gate timings, quantity of resident car parking spaces, there is no existing bus shelter at stop 2440
- Signed petition attached.

#### **49. Margaret McEntegart 128a KRL**

- Similar submission to James Purcell, summarised at submission No. 38 above.
- Concern of impact of Bus Gates to residents of Kimmage Road Lower
- There is a need for residents to be allowed access through the Bus Gate, technology exists to afford this.
- Concern of raised pavement treatment plans and impact upon the laneway access to properties 128a, 128b, 128c, and 128e Lower Kimmage Road.
- The raised pavement and cycle path to the front of No. 128a will prevent deliveries by service vehicles, impact waste collection and bins and emergency access.
- As a wheelchair user the observer is not permitted by DCC to have a disabled parking spaces outside as she has access to rear parking space.

- Concern of impact upon property value.
- Request that unencumbered access and egress is maintained to the lane between 128c and 130 LKR, by way of road markings and traffic signage.
- Bus stop shelter at bus stop 2391, Priory Road, is impractical due to narrow width of footpath.
- 30Kph speed limit on Kimmage Road Lower is not realistic or fuel efficient.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

#### **50. Martin Kelly**

- Concern with respect to Apartment 44 Greenville Place, Clanbrassil Street.
- Concern with respect to construction compound K3 located directly outside bedroom windows.
- Concern of tree planting proposed.
- Concern of negative impact to amenity of property and hence property value.

#### **51. Senator Mary Seery Kearney**

- Flawed initial premises.
- Concern of proportionality, cost, CPO, build cost, consultancy, design, legal fees.
- Key measures are efficiency, safety, integration, sustainability.
- Concern that the cost and reduction in quality of life and environmental impact far outweighs any theorised improvements.
- Concern of traffic dispersion, increased volume of traffic and congestion to surrounding residential roads.
- Concern of environmental pollution from congestion.
- Concern cumulative impact of all the bus corridors has not been carried out.
- Concern of reduced access to traditional thoroughfare roads.
- Concerns for pedestrians regarding the diminution in safety at evening and night time brought by the introduction of LED lighting.
- Welcomes the delivery of cycling infrastructure.

- Concern segregated cycling tracks are not continuous along the CBC routes.
- Concern that a minimum of 2 meters cycle track width is not reached throughout whole sections of the proposed cycle tracks.
- Concern of road sharing between cyclists and pedestrians at Poddle Park
- Support the concern of residents of Mount Argus Close / Court and View with respect to new quiet cycle route and opening up access to their area, adding significant cyclists numbers and concerns of safety and security, personal injury.
- Concern alternatives such as congestion charges, subsidised or free bus services and a proper on street or underground metro system has not been considered.
- It is not just residents in these suburbs who use public transport, people coming to Dublin for matches, music gigs, hospital appointments and a plethora of other reasons also come to Dublin and a significant portion come by car.
- Concern for access arrangements for residents of Gandon Close, St. Clare's Road and Mount Jerome, they will have to double back on themselves to travel towards town.
- Concern of longer and more circuitous routes for local residents accessing local hospitals, shops, services and amenities.
- Concern of flawed public consultation. The NTA has left themselves wide open to a challenge under the Aarhus Convention for a failure to properly engage in public consultation.
- Concern bus drivers were not consulted with.
- ABP should have published criteria and methodology for how it intends to deal with assessment, rationale for acceptance or refusal of Busconnects.
- Concern of amendments to turns and road markings along the route.
- **Request that an OH be held.**
- Concern of removal of bus stops, esp. for elderly and disability access.
- Concern of impact upon parks, sports facilities and playgrounds
- Concern reasonable alternatives, i.e. metro, have not been properly considered.
- The businesses in Kimmage and Sundrive Road will be disproportionately impacted.
- Concern for traders on Clanbrassil Street with respect to loading and unloading.
- Concern time saving purported does not outweigh the impact to local residents.
- Concern of negative impact to cultural and historical heritage, in particular the Stoneboat and its surrounding ecosystem.

- Concern the change in DCC City Development Plan during the design process has not been fully regarded.
- Concern of impacts on Heritage and the Environment.
- Concern of proposal to place bollards at Derravaragh / Corrib Road.
- Bollards at Aideen Road should be removed to facilitate local access and given they will no longer be required.
- Submission includes transcripts of emails, calls and texts
- Many microscopic and larger changes are required to meet the needs of local residents.
- A broad acceptance without detailed explanations of your reasoning for acceptance or rejection of the entirety or the individual elements of the scheme will not be acceptable.
- Concern that there are conflicts in base plans and contradictions across plans supplied for those affected by CPOs.

#### **52. Melanie Pine and Others, 50, 51 & 52 Clanbrassil Street**

- Concern with respect to loss of car parking on Clanbrassil Street Upper
- Proposal to reduce paid parking from 11 no. spaces to 6 no. spaces, all located on the western side of the street, with no parking at any other time, will be detrimental to business and lives of residents.
- Concern of impact upon deliveries, tradesmen parking.
- Concern of impact upon elderly residents, one of which is 73 years of age.
- Making life difficult for existing residents and businesses is contrary to principles of good urban planning.
- Object to reduction of paid parking on the west side of the street
- Object to the elimination of paid parking on the east side of the street.
- Object to elimination of parking between 10am and 12 noon, between 7pm and 7 am and on Sundays.

#### **53. Metro South West Group**

- 30 pages submission in favour of Metro as a better alternative to BusConnects in this part of the city.
- Not specific to Kimmage to City Centre Busconnects scheme, broad analysis in favour of Metro.

- Submits that the proposed bus corridors will have insufficient capacity to cater for the forecast demand for public transport in Southwest Dublin.
- Submits Busconnects proposals are not aligned with the Draft Dublin City Centre Transport Plan in that many people, who wish to use public transport to access the city centre will not be able to do so as the Busconnects offerings will be insufficient to accommodate them.
- Concern narrow streets in Southwest Dublin a solution which is not exclusively street based is required to facilitate modal shift.
- Requests that ABP to allow Metrolink to come no further south than St. Stephen's Green – so as to preserve the possibility of continuing from St. Stephens Green to Portobello / Rathmines.
- Accompanied with appendices of list of residents associations and groups participating in MSWG and questions on the number of buses required to pass through Dawson Street in peak period currently and in 2028 and 2048.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern no OH was held.
- There will be a large deficit in public transport provision on the F corridor and also on the A and D corridors.
- The NTA suggestions re Luas on-street post 2042 are incoherent and contradictory.
- The NTA dismissal of continuing Metrolink from the city to SW Dublin lacks credibility.
- No new issues raised.

#### **54. Michael McMahon and Nathalie Peret 47 Rathgar Avenue.**

- Concern Bus Gate at Kenilworth Square North will divert westbound traffic onto Rathgar Avenue.
- EIAR Chapter 6 does not provide detailed traffic analysis of the impact.
- Concern of gully's and drainage problems at the junction to HCR.



- Concern of potential Noise and Vibration impacts assessed at 5m from the road edge does not address houses closer than that (3.5m).
- Air Quality impact has not been assessed for Rathgar Avenue with displaced traffic.
- Concern proposal will make it difficult to access driveway at property with increased traffic.

#### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been addressed.
- No new issues raised.

#### **55. Michael O' Donoghue, 128 Kimmage Road Lower**

- Similar submission to James Purcell, summarised at submission No. 38 above.
- Concern of raised pavement treatment plans and impact upon the laneway access to properties 126 – 136 Lower Kimmage Road.

#### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Unnecessary proposed traffic island, positioned in front of 126 – 140 LKR, overbearing development, creates access difficulties and prohibits homeowners' potential to use EV's.
- No new issues raised.

#### **56. Mount Argus and Church Park Residents**

- Concern of proposed 'stoneboat' cycle route from Sundrive Road through Mount Argus Estate.
- Concern for heritage of Stoneboat built in 1245 AD Loss of cultural heritage, impact of boardwalk upon stone boat feature

- Question necessity of the new proposed cycle path. Alternative cycle route through Eamonn Ceant Park.
- Lack of consideration of past experience with respect to security issues, and community spirit and safety,
- Concern of increase in anti-social behaviour.
- Concern of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.
- Lack of consultation and evidence showing where cycle paths in enclosed estates work for the community
- Loss of biodiversity

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern the NTA have not understood the issues raised.
- Concern of traffic safety due to inclusion of a cycle route in the Mount Argus Estate and removal of slip lanes at the entrance to the estate.
- No new issues raised.

#### **57. Mount Drummond District Residents Association**

- Serious concern of rat-running, traffic from Harold's Cross Road through to O'Hara Avenue and illegal right-turn onto Grove Road to avoid right-turn ban at Robert Emmet Bridge.
- Concern of eastbound rat-run from Parnell Road turning right to go south in absence of filter at main junction.
- Need to retain and expand the Yellow box at Armstrong Street junction.
- Concern traffic impact modelling is adequate and robust.
- Monitoring of traffic impact before and after implementation of the proposed restriction on the right hand turn at Harolds Cross Bridge from HCR to Grove Road is required.
- Constant monitoring is required.

### **58. Orwell Park (Templeogue) Residents Association**

- Concern information is deficient with respect to number of buses forecast in the peak hour on the corridor, how buses will be able to proceed through the city centre, how F1, 81 and 82 bus services will operate when the spawell roundabout is converted to a signal controlled junction.
- Concern of uncertainty and limited benefits (time saving)
- Concern of CBA
- Concern of severe disruption for cars
- Recommend that if approved that conditions are applied to impose fareless journeys, limit construction and expenditure, reduce bans on right hand turns, further investigation of Metrolink from Stephens Green to SW Dublin.
- Bus Gates in Kimmage will increase traffic on Wellington Lane, Templeogue, which will impact the cycle route towards Kimmage.
- Severely restricted access by car from Templeogue to City Centre.
- Attached the Metro South West Group submission.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

### **59. Our Lady's Hospice & Care Services**

- Concern with respect to Plot Ref. 1019(1).1a, 1019(2).1f, 1019(3).2a, 1019(4).2f in the ownership of Our Lady's Hospice and Care Services.
- The NTA has proposed the site / land as a 'car park' and it is to be used as construction compound K2 for a period of 15 months.
- Concern of impact on the hospice's proposal to expand the facility.
- Submit that the location of the proposed car park is the last remaining piece of land / site for expansion of the hospice.
- Lands to the rear of the hospice are in separate ownership and not available as an alternative site for expansion.
- Concern proposal for a car park at this location is contrary to local and national planning policy.

- Concern of impact of construction compound upon only access to the hospice due to location of K2.
- Car park at this location is contrary to all local and national policy, which seeks to encourage sustainable methods of transport use.
- Concern EIAR is deficient in its assessment. Inadequate assessment of impacts: access restriction beside construction compound, noise, and dust. Human Health & Population – risk of traffic delays for access to hospice.
- Concern that the '4-part Proportionality Test' has not been met.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Failure of the NTA to adequately respond to the concerns raised.
- No new issues raised.

#### **60. Paddy Glynn, 56 Lower Kimmage Road**

- Support the views of LORCA
- Concern of narrow roads and fit for Busconnects
- Lack of trust to NTA proposals.
- Broadly supportive of the proposed scheme.
- Concern transparent monitoring of impacts will be carried out.
- Cumulative traffic data modelling must be made available.
- Request to reinstate the weekday 7-10am left-turn ban at Sundrive Cross towards the north.
- Need to develop school zone traffic management at Clareville Road.
- Implement lower speed limits sooner.
- Requirement for more pedestrian crossings on Kimmage Road Lower.
- Requirement for better quality surfacing for cyclists on Kimmage Road Lower.
- Remove bus gate at northern end of Harold's Cross Park.
- Concern to removal of footpath at southern end of Harold's Cross Park.

- Concern to road widening with CPO on Harold's Cross Road and Clanbrassil Street Upper.
- Concern with proposals at Robert Emmet Bridge.
- Technology exists for 'White listing' for local traffic through bus gates.
- Request that E-charging points are explored.
- Park & Ride at city boundaries should be considered.
- Limited proposals for landscaping and biodiversity are welcome but should be more extensive.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Enforcement welcomed.
- Public realm improvements welcomed.
- Concern of personal security at Mount Argus estate.
- Concern of CPO of front gardens.
- Would like to thank the NTA for the breath of consultation engaged in with the public and with community groups.
- No new issues raised.

#### **61. Paul Cashman, 25 Airfield Road, Rathgar**

- Concern with regard to Plot List 1002(1).1g, 1002(2).2a, 1002(3).2g,
- Concern of impact upon Mount Argus Square apartments.
- Concern of impact upon bin storage and security.
- Concern of impact of cycleway upon biodiversity of the Poddle.
- Concern of safety and necessity of the cycleway.
- Concern of the proposal to remove access to five points crossroads from Kenilworth Sq. negative impact to surrounding roads and no joined up thinking on roads with DCC.

#### **62. Paul Ryan and Others, 19 Greenmount House, Greenmount Office Park, HC**

- Premise of scheme is flawed, and Metro is preferred.

- Proposals will increase traffic and journey times.
- Every journey is not into the city centre.
- Refers to numerous traffic restrictions across 3 CBC schemes and the implications for traffic in places such as Rathmines, Rathgar, Ranelagh, Terenure, Crumlin.
- Segregated cycle lanes not continuous along CBC.
- Concern to 24/7 bus gates.
- Flawed public consultation during COVID.
- Concern of disproportionate impacts for many businesses, including difficult delivery routes.
- The schools in the area are all on roads which will have increased traffic volumes.
- Concern for elderly, visually impaired, mobility challenged, child safety.
- Concern of negative impacts to local residents, businesses and community.

#### **63. Peter Drennan 73 Poddle Park.**

- Concern of Bus Gate and closure of Poddle Park to through traffic.
- Concern of traffic diversion onto residential streets and past schools.
- Concern of longer routes for residents via Stannaway Road.
- Concern of delay for emergency vehicles.
- Failed Consultation procedure. Residents of Poddle Park did not receive a letter as “impacted properties”

#### **64. Recorders Residents Association**

- Concern the consultation process was not inclusive of all residents, fundamentally flawed.
- Concern that route options ‘A’, ‘F’ and ‘D’ will negatively impact upon neighbourhoods and daily lives.
- Concern cumulative impact has not been adequately assessed of route options ‘A’, ‘F’ and ‘D’.
- Concern of cross city bus route, continuation of buses to the north side of the city, solution is not part of the project.

- Concern of the function of the core corridor.
- Concern of:
  - Closure of the LKR from 7.00 am – 10.00 am x 365 days to general traffic from Ravensdale to Harolds Cross
  - Evening traffic will be impacted 4pm – 8 pm
  - The removal of 3 slip roads at KCR
  - Closure of section of Kenilworth Road to general traffic
- Concern of cross city and orbital journeys.
- Concern of justification of the project in terms of cost and time saving achieved.
- Concern of number of buses on each corridor, capacity issues and frequency.
- Consideration of underground option should be explored.
- Concern Metro option ignored.
- Concern that park and ride facilities are not incorporated.
- Concern of failure to consider alternative options.
- Concern traffic modelling is deficient and cannot be relied upon.
- Concern of loss of 300 year old mature trees.
- Concern of impact on Terenure Road East and destruction of character of Terenure Village.
- Concern of imbalance in relation to common good.
- Concern of distance between bus stops. No outbound bus stop at the garda station in Rathmines.
- Concern carbon emission will be increased.
- Request that a feasibility study on the south west area be carried out and evaluated.
- There is a need for more introduction of local link routes, cashless payments, dedicated school buses, monitoring of bus priority.
- Suggest evening Busgate closure on lower Kimmage Road should be shortened to 4 pm to 7 pm to facilitate businesses and nighttime economy and taxis.
- Concerns raised by Cheeverstown House, represented by Cheeverstown House Employment Support Services on 198 Whitehall Road, of impact to people with intellectual disabilities living in south west Dublin.
- Concern pedestrians are required to cross over cycle lanes to get on and off a bus.
- Concern of the changes to bus routes and loss of direct bus routes for people with disabilities.

- Combined impact of 3 CBC schemes.
- Rail alternative to other CBCs in Dublin.
- Metro needed instead / as well.
- Poor public awareness of BusConnects and CBC schemes.
- Traffic restrictions on two main routes to city: Kimmage and Terenure.
- Traffic restrictions proposed at 36 different locations across the 3 schemes will cause extensive displacements, disruption, and delays.
- Car trips will only decline by 1.5% and some local journey times will more than double in distance and time. Implications for Climate Action Plan commitments due to increased fuel consumption.
- Very small increases in proposed bus services.
- Many local businesses across the Dublin 6W and Dublin 12 areas need vehicle access routes.
- Road space is not fairly allocated by mode share.
- Increased carbon emissions due to BusConnects.
- Corridors are considered in isolation.
- Provide local school bus services.
- Open southern bus gate to traffic at 7pm rather than 8pm

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have been responded to satisfactorily.
- Concern that the No. 81 Bus route will serve the Bord Gais theatre.
- Concern no OH was held.
- No new issues raised.

#### **65. Religious Sisters of Charity (RSC) Entrance to our Lady's Hospital**

- Concern with regard to Plot List 1019(1).1a, 1019(2).1f, 1019(3).2a, 1019(4).2f
- Sister Theresa Kennedy and Sister Una O'Neill are incorrectly stated on the CPO Schedule as being 'Owners or Reputed Owners'.



- The RSC has property within Our Lady's Hospice campus, the congregation shares the use of the campus avenue with Our Lady's Hospice and Focus Housing Association
- Concern of impact upon access, uninterrupted passage for access utilities, services etc
- Concern of proposal for a 22 space public car park.
- Lack of information on new entrance gates and management of same, maintenance, repair, control of acquired avenue and management, operation, control of the car parking spaces.
- Concern of traffic and access disruption and health and safety risks.
- Concern that Proportionality Test has not been met.
- Disproportionate interference with property rights.
- If ABP decides to approve the subject scheme they should do so with 'modifications' removing the proposed acquisition of Plot List 1019(1).1a, 1019(2).1f, 1019(3).2a, 1019(4).2f

#### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been satisfactorily addressed.
- Note that the NTA has agreed to remove reference to Sister Theresa Kennedy and Sister Una O'Neill as 'Owners or Reputed Owners'.
- Clarification is still sought about the retention of easement rights, security and the use and maintenance of the proposed car park.
- Disproportionate use of CPO
- No new issues raised.

#### **66. Ruth Glennon & Others, Harolds Cross Educate Together N.S 151 / 153 HCR**

- Concern there is no provision in BusConnects scheme for "School Zone" with 30 km/h speed limit along HCR.

- Concern school has been requesting signage since it opened in 2019 and this has not been granted.
- Concern no signage or traffic calming measures included in the proposal to indicate the location of the school.
- Concern of children crossing on HCR
- Concern cyclists disregard pedestrian lights and travel at speed along this stretch of road.
- Welcome much need improvement to public realm
- Concern cycle paths are less than advisory 2m
- Concern of cyclist collision and safe access for cyclists to the school.
- Concern of reduction of footpath on southern end of Harolds Cross Park.
- Concern that the proposed Bus gate from Kimmage Road Lower at the junction with Sundrive Road outlines a left-turn ban from Sundrive Road onto Kimmage Road Lower for general traffic and will give rise to rat-running.
- Concern of safety of crossing point at Clareville Road and Kenilworth Park, need for safe pedestrian crossing.
- Compliance with DMURS is required.

**67. Saint Martins Residents Association c/o Karen Talbot 13 St. Martin's Park**

- Reduced hours for southern Bus Gate No.1 welcomed but not necessary at weekends. No impact assessment for the residents.
- Bus Gate No.2 at McGowan's should operate at same peak hours as Bus Gate No.1.
- Bus Gate No.3 at northern end of Harold's Cross Park: southbound operational times unclear.
- All bus gates should operate only at peak hours 5 days a week.
- Concern that advisory cycle lanes been removed south of Sundrive Cross in favour of parking.
- Proposal to reduce road width to accommodate car parking spaces is unsafe and unsustainable.
- Concern there is no assessment in the EIAR on removal of the advisory lanes.
- Contradiction between text and drawings. Concern there is too much parking generally.

- Concern cumulative impact of all busconnects schemes in tandem has not been considered.
- Additional pedestrian crossings requested on Kimmage Road Lower, outside Tesco.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been satisfactorily addressed.
- No new issues raised.

#### **68. Sharon Sabin & Bruno Rodrigues de Oliveira, 1 mount Argus Court**

- Objection to the proposed cycle route and Stone Boat Boardwalk, similar to other residents in the estate. Little benefit for cyclists.
- Questionable necessity, it is not an improvement and makes no sense.
- Safety on local streets shared with traffic.
- Anti-social behaviour and security risk to Mount Argus estate, concern of proposal to provide access to Mount Argus Way from Sundrive Road, with removal of a wall.
- Biodiversity along River Poddle.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been satisfactorily addressed.
- No new issues raised.

#### **69. Simeon Rimmer & Sheila Hourigan, 4 Greenmount Avenue, HC**

- Proposed Scheme will increase incentive for drivers to short cut through the narrow streets west of Harold's Cross Road to circumvent the proposed right-turn ban into Grove Road creating a rat-run.

- Concern of reduced residential amenity, safety issues esp. to pedestrians and cyclists.
- Request mitigation of the impact on traffic on Greenmount Avenue and Greenmount Lane.

**70. Siobhán McClean, 282 KRL**

- Supports Proposed Scheme in general, in particular the bus gates, junction improvements, public realm, cycling facilities in Harold's Cross and Clanbrassil Street.
- Concerned about low-quality cycling facilities on Kimmage Road Lower.
- Concern advisory cycle lane removed and replaced with car parking spaces.
- Concern off street car parking required for affected residents
- Need for traffic calming to complement 30 km/h speed limit and enforcement cameras.
- Bus Gate should operate 24/7, or at least be extended to cover school closure times in the afternoons.
- Studies have shown that a reduction in through traffic helps businesses.

**71. South Dublin Electrical Wholesale Ltd, 84 Lower Clanbrassil Street**

- Concern of impact of construction compound and storage unit in the immediate vicinity of their business.
- Concern of impact upon access to business.
- Construction compound should be relocated – moved to St. Vincent Street Flats public car park.

**72. St. Anne's Residents' Association**

- Concern traffic restrictions in the Proposed Scheme, and in combination with other CBC schemes will have a negative impact for residents of this estate.
- Concern of loss of access to services, amenities and local facilities.
- Concern for elderly and sick people to access services.
- Concern congestion will give rise to carbon emissions
- Supportive of the scheme objectives
- Traffic restrictions in the KCR area should be refused, bus lanes and priority traffic signalling would suffice.

### **73. Stannaway Road Residents**

- Supportive of BusConnects Scheme,
- Concerned about impacts of displaced traffic to surrounding residential area.
- Concern in reduction of 50% in bus frequency when No.83 route replaced.
- Concern of non-compliance with existing HGV ban on Stannaway Road.
- Concern no measures in the Proposed Scheme to mitigate traffic impacts on Stannaway Road.
- Concern that Appendix A6.1 -TIA-Appendix 1 - Transport Modelling Report, Table 5.2 JTC Locations, 11-5 Kimmage Road Lower/Ravensdale Park has 28,364 daily vehicle movements. Therefore, there is a significant chance that up to 10.3 million additional vehicles per year could naturally redirect onto the narrow residential roads of Stannaway Road, Cashel Road and Captains Road.
- Scheme includes traffic management proposals east of Kimmage Road Lower (3 of the 4 mentioned are existing), but only 1 restriction to the west at Poddle Park.
- Poddle Park cycle route duplicates the cycle lanes on Kimmage Road Lower and should remain open as a traffic route alternative to Stannaway Road.
- Ferns Road already restricted between 7-10am, but not observed or enforced.
- Speeding on 1.5km of Stannaway Road as it's a long straight road. Full ramps requested.
- No mitigation for noise and vibration on Stannaway Road. Air quality concerns.
- Delays for proposed new No.82 bus on Stannaway Road.
- More pedestrian crossings requested on Stannaway Road.
- Enforcement of existing traffic restrictions.
- Residents of Stannaway Road were excluded from consultation process on the basis that mitigation was not required on the road.
- Concern traffic will bring noise, vibrations, blocked entrances, rat running, speeding, pollution, reduced safety for children and the vulnerable, removal of safe streets and increased stress.
- Concern of loss of local businesses.
- Concern that no traffic calming is proposed on Stannaway Road.
- Accompanied with appendices of list of names and email communication with NTA

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been satisfactorily addressed.
- Highlight Active Travel's proposal to potentially put a cycle lane along Stannaway Road in conflict with the additional redirected HGVs / LGV / Cars. Lack of joined up thinking.
- Negative impacts on Stannaway Road are unnecessarily disproportionate.
- No new issues raised.

#### **74. Terenure/Templeogue Sustainable Community**

- Unhappy with consultation process during COVID.
- Objection to 3 bus gates, which will displace traffic onto other roads south of KCR.
- Only Bus gate which should be allowed is the one closest to Mount Jerome Cemetery.
- Bus Gate at Ravensdale will give rise to increased traffic and congestion on Fortfield Road, TRW and Wainsfort Road.
- Concern of congestion and diverted traffic in particular HGV's
- Cycle lanes welcomed.
- Right-turn lanes should be retained at Grand Canal and South Circular Road.
- Combined impacts of 3 adjoining CBCs need to be considered. In combination effects.
- Accompanied with petition of signatures.

#### **75. Terenure West Residents Association**

- Highlight that the €100 to comment on 2 CBC schemes in the same area is unfair.
- Welcome the scheme overall, agree car use needs to be reduced.
- Concern of increased traffic volume on local roads, particularly Fortfield Road, Greenlea Road and TRW
- Concern of loss of access to Kimmage Village and northbound from TRW
- Concern the negatives outweigh the benefits to local residents.
- Concern the proposal is environmentally damaging.
- Inadequate consultation process.

#### **76. – Tesco Ireland Ltd.**

- Request for loading bay at premises on Kimmage Road Lower at junction with Corrib Road.
- Unclear if existing loading bay is to be retained outside the Tesco store
- The introduction of bus gates means that the current approach for deliveries to Tesco Kimmage Express store is no longer possible.
- To avoid unsuitable access requirements (U-turns and access via narrow residential streets) it is requested that a suitable delivery window in bus gates operational hours is considered or permitting HGV's pass through Bus Gates.
- Acknowledge and welcome the need to improve the accessibility of our city.
- Ask that the importance of servicing and accessibility be recognised.

#### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- Concern issues raised have not been satisfactorily addressed.
- Unclear if the loading bay outside of Tesco Express at Leonards Corner on the SCR is to be retained or removed.
- Concern no loading bay proposed outside Tesco Express on Kimmage Road Lower at Corrib Road
- The loading bay is fundamental to the running of a retail store.
- No new issues raised.

#### **77. The Estate of Joy Ordman, Deceased c/o Shoshana Khan & Semone Eppel**

- Concern with regard to Plot List 1001(1).1a, Easement Plot List: CA
- The estate concerns 11 – 13 Sundrive Road
- Concern of creation of the 2-way Dodder Cycleway adjoining the doorway to No. 11, it limits access for deliveries and impact emergency access use of the door.
- The Dodder Cycleway will impact upon maintenance and repair access of 11 – 13 Sundrive Road.

- Concern of impact upon future development potential of the building.
- Concern of legal rights over the cycleway to access 11 – 13 Sundrive road – legal and title information in respect of reduced and narrowed access.
- Concern of proposal to locate a construction compound at K1
- Concern of loss of car parking spaces for residents of 11 – 13 Sundrive Road, negative impact upon tenant deliveries and collections for retailing and business.

### **Response to NTAs Comments on submission**

**The third parties responded to the NTAs comments in relation to the proposed scheme as follows:**

- No new issues raised.

#### **78. – Mount Jerome Cemetery and Crematorium**

- Combined impacts of 20 bus gates along 5 bus corridors in the southwest sector restricting access routes to the cemetery. 4 of these bus gates are in the Kimmage CBC scheme.
- Primary objection to 3 bus gates located on Kimmage Road Lower which will sever primary access route for funeral corteges to the cremation and burial facility at Mount Jerome Cemetery and Crematorium.
- Varying operational hours for different bus gates – lack of consistency.
- Funeral cortege routes described from 9 churches with maps of the alternative routes required to avoid the bus gates.
- Local impact of the two bus gates at Harold's Cross Park which will divert all funeral corteges along a single route at the southern end of the park.
- Funerals take place from 10:00 to 16:00 Monday to Saturday, with peak from 11:00 to 16:00.
- Northbound right-turn restriction at Grand Canal to Grove Road will divert exit traffic towards the southeast.
- Risk of local congestion on the roads adjacent the cemetery.
- Two options proposed for mitigation measures: omit the two bus gates at Harold's Cross Road and Kimmage Road Lower or reduce their operational hours to peak



periods similar to those for Bus Gate No.1 at Ravensdale Park. (6am – 10am and 4pm – 8pm)

**79. The Harold's Cross Village Community Council c/o Dr. Paula Russell, 31 Westfield Road, HC**

- Umbrella organisation with delegates from 10 residents' associations.
- Scheme welcomed in general for better infrastructure for active travel modes.
- Acknowledge the benefits of bus gates, but traffic will increase on some other roads including Kenilworth Park and Clareville Road.
- Need to ensure that traffic calming measures are provided at schools.
- Bike parking on Clareville Road near the junction with Kenilworth Park should be removed to provide 2 traffic lanes.
- EIAR Chapter 4 (page 27) does not clearly describe the 24 hours restriction of southbound traffic at the most northerly bus gate in Harold's Cross. Advance warning signs will be required in both directions for this.
- Interaction with other CBC scheme bus gates in Rathmines will increase traffic on Leinster Road.
- Increased traffic at Kenilworth Square and Rathgar Avenue due to westbound bus gate at Harold's Cross Road junction.
- Concern of traffic increases of 179 to 273 vehicles per hour on various roads listed in EIAR Table 6-53. More localised traffic modelling sought in vicinity of Harold's Cross Road.
- Public realm improvements requested as mitigation.
- Previous proposal for no left-turn eastbound from Sundrive Road to Kimmage Road Lower has been omitted from the Proposed Scheme – should be included.
- Concern right-turn restriction onto Grove Road risks rat-running through Mount Drummond area.
- Notable that pedestrian crossing on Kimmage Road Lower at McGowan's pub proposed under separate planning permission.
- Additional pedestrian crossings requested on Kimmage Road Lower in vicinity of Aideen Avenue, and Kenilworth Park / Westfield Road.
- Concern of removal of footpath at southern side of Harold's Cross Park.
- Concern of impact for setting of park. Concern of damage to granite kerb stones.

- Concern re: school zones on Harold's Cross Road and Clareville Road: traffic calming measures and 30 km/h speed limits requested.
- Supportive of cycle lanes along Harold's Cross Road, but increased traffic may impact safety.
- Concern that the cycle lane on HCR is sub-standard.
- Bus gates will improve safety for cyclists along Kimmage Road Lower.
- Reservations about the Stone Boat Boardwalk in context of truncated Poddle Cycleway route that does not continue through Mount Argus.
- More public realm improvements requested in Harold's Cross Village, and regrets that previous proposals are curtailed in Kimmage Village.
- More street furniture and public realm requested on KRL particularly beyond Mt Argus Church.
- Concern of CPO of front gardens of 15 houses from 33 to 61 HCR
- Concern of CPO of lands in front of sheltered housing operated on HCR.
- Concern of impact upon heritage.
- Need for ongoing monitoring and engagement.
- Recognises this is an important project for the future of the city, believe there are opportunities to improve it overall.

#### **80. The Passionist Community, Virtus, St. Paul's Retreat, Mount Argus**

- Benefits of the busconnects scheme are recognised.
- Concern of impact upon access to Mount Argus Church
- Concern impact upon the requirement of an ageing population is addressed.
- Concern parishioners and visitors can still access the church easily.
- Concern vehicular access is maintained from Kimmage Road Lower to provide for funerals, weddings and other church events.
- Concern access to the car park is retained along Kimmage Road Lower.
- Concern of impact of busgates and request that hours of operation are reduced / amended to 6am – 10 am and 4pm – 8pm and they are only operational Monday – Friday.

#### **81. The Wine Pair c/o Canice Mckee 79-81 Clanbrassil Street Lower.**

- Appreciate the necessity of urban development projects.

- Concern of impact of construction compound and storage unit in the immediate vicinity of their business.
- Concern of impact upon access to business.
- Concern of obscuring signage and hampering business.
- Concern of impact upon outdoor seating and customer experience.
- Concern of attracting anti social behaviour.
- Construction compound should be relocated – will remove the tiny amount of green space in the area.
- Concern of high fees associated with the public consultation process.

#### **82. Thom's Pharmacy and Opticians c/o Fergal O'Dwyer 151 KRL**

- Concern of restricted access for customers and deliveries, due to bus gate on LKR.
- Concern of impact upon vulnerable clientele of the pharmacy.
- A lot of patients have mobility issues and arrive by private car.
- Car parking further up the street is constantly full and will not meet demand.
- Concern of how deliveries will be made to vulnerable patients.

#### **83. TII**

- Acknowledges and supports the Busconnects project which aims to improve public transport and address climate change in Dublin and other cities.
- The proposed scheme does not include any direct interactions with the national roads or light rail (Luas) networks.
- No observations.

#### **84. Yvonne McKenna 143 Corrib Road**

- Objection to bus gate 24/7, even when buses are not running
- Concern of restricted access to Bushy Park for football coaching.
- Corrib Road will become a rat-run.